

$\mathcal{B}$ -Bounded Cohomology and Applications

RONGHUI JI
CRICHTON OGLE
BOBBY RAMSEY

A discrete group with word-length (G, L) is $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological for a bounding classes $\mathcal{B}$ if the comparison map from $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology to ordinary cohomology (with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}$) is an isomorphism; it is strongly $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological if the same is true with arbitrary coefficients. In this paper we establish some basic conditions guaranteeing strong $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomologicality. In particular, we show strong $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomologicality for an FP^∞ group G if all of the weighted G -sensitive Dehn functions are $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded. Such groups include all $\mathcal{B}$ -asynchronously combable groups; moreover, the class of such groups is closed under constructions arising from groups acting on an acyclic complex. We also provide examples where the comparison map fails to be injective, as well as surjective, and give an example of a solvable group with quadratic first Dehn function, but exponential second Dehn function. Finally, a relative theory of $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology of groups with respect to subgroups is introduced. Relative isocohomologicality is determined in terms of a new notion of *relative* Dehn functions and a *relative* FP^∞ property for groups with respect to a collection of subgroups. Applications for computing $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology of groups are given in the context of relatively hyperbolic groups and developable complexes of groups.

[46L80](#), [20F65](#); [46M18](#)

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Preliminaries	9
2.1	Bounding Classes	9
2.2	The FP^α and HF^α conditions	10

2.3	$\mathcal{B}$ -homology and $\mathcal{B}$ -cohomology of algebras	11
2.4	$\mathcal{B}$ -homology and $\mathcal{B}$ -cohomology of weighted complexes	12
2.5	Dehn functions	15
2.5.1	The geometric setting	15
2.5.2	The algebraic setting	17
2.6	Products, coproducts and pairing operations	22
3	$\mathcal{B}$ cohomology of discrete groups	24
3.1	Combable groups	24
3.2	$\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomologicality and type BHF^∞ groups	29
4	Relative constructions	36
4.1	Relative HF^n and the Brown-Bieri-Eckmann condition	36
4.2	Relative Dehn functions	41
4.3	Relative $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology	44
5	Two spectral sequences in $\mathcal{B}$-bounded cohomology	52
5.1	The Hochschild-Serre spectral sequence	52
5.2	The spectral sequence associated to a group acting on a complex . . .	55
6	Duality groups and the comparison map	59
6.1	Duality and Poincaré Duality Groups	59
6.2	Isocohomologicality and the fundamental class	59
6.3	$\mathcal{B}$ -duality groups	61
6.4	Two solvmanifolds	62
6.5	More on the comparison map	66
	Bibliography	69

1 Introduction

To a bounding class of functions $\mathcal{B}$, a group with length (G, L) and a weighted G -complex (X, w) one can associate the $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded, G -equivariant cohomology of X with coefficients in a $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module V :

$$\mathcal{B}H_G^*(X; V)$$

The construction is a variant on that used in the non-bounded case. Starting with (G, L) and $\mathcal{B}$, one constructs a bornological algebra $H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ - a completion of the group algebra $\mathbb{C}[G]$ - and a bornological $H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module $\mathcal{B}C_*(EG \times X)$ - a similar completion of the the complex of singular chains $C_*(EG \times X)$. Then given a bornological $H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module V , one forms the (co)complex

$$\mathcal{B} \operatorname{Hom}_{H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}(\mathcal{B}C_*(EG \times X), V)$$

of bounded $H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module homomorphisms. The cohomology groups $\mathcal{B}H_G^*(X; V)$ are then defined as the (algebraic) cohomology groups of this complex. There is a natural transformation of functors

$$\mathcal{B}H_-^*(-; -) \rightarrow H_-^*(-; -)$$

which, for given values, is referred to as the comparison map

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^* = \Phi_{\mathcal{B},G}^*(X; V) : \mathcal{B}H_G^*(X; V) \rightarrow H_G^*(X; V)$$

One wants to know the properties of this map; when it is injective, surjective, and what structures are preserved under it. In some special cases, quite a bit is known. For example, taking $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_{\min} = \{\text{constant functions}\}$ yields $H_{\mathcal{B}_{\min},L}(G) = \ell^1(G)$, and the resulting cohomology theory is simply the equivariant bounded cohomology of X with coefficients in the Banach $\ell^1(G)$ -module V . At the other extreme, when $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_{\max} = \{f : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \mid f \text{ non-decreasing}\}$, the comparison map becomes an isomorphism under appropriate finiteness conditions: G is an FP^∞ group and X is a G -complex with finitely many orbits in each dimension. More interesting, and also more subtle, is the case when the bounding class $\mathcal{B}$ lies between these two extremes, because it is in this range that the weight function on X and word-length function on G have the potential for influencing the $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology groups in a non-trivial way. To illustrate why this is of interest, we consider two applications.

- The topological K -theory of $\ell^1(G)$. Here the bounding class $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{P} = \{\text{non-decreasing polynomials}\}$ is of particular interest, as $H_{\mathcal{P},L}(G)$ is a smooth subalgebra of $\ell^1(G)$. Taking $X = pt$ and $V = \mathbb{C}$, the image of $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^*$ consists precisely

of those cohomology classes in $H^*(G) = H^*(G; \mathbb{C})$ which are polynomially bounded with respect to the word-length function on G . Such classes therefore satisfy the ℓ^1 -analogue of the Novikov Conjecture, and there is reason to believe they also satisfy the Strong Novikov Conjecture (without any additional Rapid Decay condition on the group). For this application, one would like the comparison map to be surjective.

- The Strong ℓ^1 -Bass Conjecture. Here one is interested in determining the image of the Chern character $ch_* : K_*^t(\ell^1(G)) \rightarrow HC_*^{top}(H_{\mathcal{P},L}(G))$ [JOR1]. In this case, the problem of showing that the image lies in the “elliptic summand” amounts to proving the injectivity of the comparison map (for suitable choice of X).

Of course, both properties hold when $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^*$ is bijective, i.e., when G or more precisely (G, L) is isocohomological [M1, M2]. In fact, up until this point, all proofs of either injectivity or surjectivity for a given bounding class have arisen by a verification of this stronger isocohomological property. The first type of result in this direction is due to the first author, who showed in [J] that $HC_*^{top}(H_{\mathcal{P},L}(G)) \cong HC_*(\mathbb{C}[G])$ for groups of polynomial growth. Subsequently, it was determined independently by the second author in [O1] and R. Meyer in [M1] that (G, L) is $\mathcal{P}$ -isocohomological in the case G admits a synchronous combing. Moreover, in [O1] it was shown that isocohomologicality with arbitrary coefficients, or strong $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomologicality, (at least for $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{P}$) followed for HF^∞ groups whenever all of the Dehn functions (as defined in [O1]) were polynomially bounded. This last result was significantly strengthened by the first and third authors in [JR1], where it was established (again for $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{P}$), that strong $\mathcal{P}$ -isocohomologicality for an FP^∞ group was actually equivalent to the existence of polynomially bounded Dehn functions in each degree. From this the authors were able to conclude that the comparison map (with $X = pt$), fails to be surjective for rather simple groups when one allows non-trivial coefficients. However, still unknown for the standard word-length function on G and the polynomial bounding class $\mathcal{P}$, or more generally any bounding class $\mathcal{B}$ containing the linear polynomials $\mathcal{L}$, were answers to the following questions:

- Q1. Is the comparison map $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^* = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^*(G) : \mathcal{B}H^*(G) \rightarrow H^*(G)$ always surjective?
- Q2. Is $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^*(G)$ always injective?
- Q3. If G is an HF^∞ group, are the higher Dehn functions of G $\mathcal{P}$ -equivalent to the first Dehn function of G ?

In fact, it was conjectured by the second author in [O1] that the answer to the third question was “yes”, given that all known examples at the time suggested this to be the case. Nevertheless, one of the consequences of the results of this paper is

Theorem A The answer to each of these questions is “no”.

Precisely, we show

- A1. (following Gromov) There exists a compact, closed, orientable 3-dimensional solvmanifold $M_1^3 \simeq K(G_1, 1)$ with a 2-dimensional class $t_2 \in H^2(M_1) = H^2(G_1)$ which is not $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded for any $\mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{E}$, the bounding class of simple exponential functions.
- A2. There exists a compact, closed, orientable 5-dimensional solvmanifold $M_2^5 \simeq K(G_2, 1)$, where the first Dehn function of G_2 is quadratic, but the second Dehn function is at least simple exponential.
- A3. If $\mathcal{B}$ is a bounding class with $\mathcal{B} \succeq \mathcal{L}$, and G is a finitely-presented FL group (meaning BG is homotopy-equivalent to a finite complex) for which the comparison map $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^*$ is not surjective with respect to the standard word-length function (as in (A1.)), there is another discrete group $\mathfrak{F}(G)$ depending on G “up to homotopy” for which the comparison map is not injective with respect to the standard word-length function on $\mathfrak{F}(G)$. Moreover, if $\mathcal{B} \succeq \mathcal{P}$, then $\mathfrak{F}(G)$ can be taken to be also of type FL .

Somewhat surprising is the sharpness of these results. For (A1.), this is the simplest type of finitely-presented group and smallest cohomological dimension in which surjectivity with trivial coefficients can fail. In the case of (A2.), we note that a linear first Dehn function implies the group is hyperbolic, in turn implying that all of the higher Dehn functions are also linear. Moreover, there is an isoperimetric gap that occurs between degree one and two, so that if the first Dehn function is not linear, it must be at least quadratic - the smallest degree for which the second Dehn function could be non-polynomial, or even non-linear. Finally, (A3.) provides, for each bounding class $\mathcal{B} \succeq \mathcal{P}$ an injection from the set of (isomorphism classes of) finitely-presented FL groups with non-surjective comparison map to the set of (isomorphism classes of) finitely-presented FL groups with non-injective comparison map.

Up until now, the main problem in studying either $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomologicality or strong $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomologicality has been the absence of appropriate computational tools. The difficulty in extending classical techniques lies in the analysis of the group structures and the geometry of the associated Cayley graph. The primary goal of this paper is to develop systematic methods for calculating $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology, and to establish isocohomologicality for a good class of groups. One such class consists of group

extensions where the normal and quotient groups are isocohomological with respect to the restricted and quotient length functions induced by the length function on the middle group. The other main class of groups considered are those associated with developable complexes of groups; this includes the class of relatively hyperbolic groups. The main computational techniques introduced are the Hochschild-Serre spectral sequence in $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology associated to an extension of groups equipped with length functions, and the Serre spectral sequence in $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology for developable complexes of groups. As has been noted by Meyer in [M2], the category in which one does homological algebra in the bornological framework is almost never abelian, which makes the extension of homological techniques from the non-bounded to the bounded setting problematic. Among the results included below, we have

Theorem B Let G be a finitely presented group acting cocompactly on a contractible simplicial complex X without inversion, with finitely generated stabilizers G_σ for each vertex σ in X , and with finite edge stabilizers. Suppose also that X is equipped with the 1-skeleton weighting, and all of its higher weighted Dehn functions are $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded. Then if each G_σ is strongly $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological, G is as well.

In [Os] and [BC] the notion of the first unweighted ‘relative Dehn function’ is introduced for a group relative to a family of subgroups. This relative Dehn function is well-defined for developable complexes of groups with finite edge stabilizers; in particular for relatively hyperbolic groups. Intuitively, the unweighted relative Dehn functions bound ‘relative fillings’ of relative cycles in a ‘relatively contractible space’. Thus, one expects that the comparison map from $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded relative cohomology to non-bounded relative cohomology is an isomorphism when the relative Dehn functions are appropriately bounded; i.e. the group is relatively isocohomological with respect to the family of subgroups.

Now it should be noted that the existence of Dehn functions, even in the absolute setting, is not guaranteed by the existence of a nice resolution. In general, one needs to work with weighted Dehn functions where the weighting degreeewise is either equivalent to a weighted ℓ^1 -norm associated to a proper weight function on an additive set of generators, or is one over which there exists some geometric control. Using the 1-skeleton weighting, we show

Theorem C Suppose the finitely presented group G is HF^∞ relative to a finite family of finitely generated subgroups $\mathcal{H}$. Then the following are equivalent.

- (1) The weighted relative Dehn functions of EG relative to $E\mathcal{H}$ are $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded.
- (2) G is strongly $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological relative to $\mathcal{H}$.
- (3) The comparison map $\mathcal{B}H^*(G, \mathcal{H}; A) \rightarrow H^*(G, \mathcal{H}; A)$ is surjective for all bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -modules A .

We should also remark that, as in the case of relative group cohomology [Au, BE2], there is a long-exact sequence in $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology relating the bounded cohomologies of the subgroups and the group with the $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded relative cohomology of the pair.

An outline of the paper is as follows.

In section 2, we recall from [JOR1] some basic terminology regarding bounding classes, and the setup for defining the G -equivariant $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology of bornological algebras and weighted complexes. We also define what we mean by a Dehn function in this paper. For FP^∞ groups, there are a number of different ways for defining Dehn functions, the most natural being algebraically defined Dehn functions which take into account the action of the group G . Also in this section we construct some basic pairing operations between $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded homology and cohomology that are used later on.

In section 3, we show¹ that asynchronously combable groups are type HF^∞ , via an explicit coning argument that allows us in section 3.2 to show that if the combing lengths are $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded, so are all of the Dehn functions of G . We also extend the main result of [JR1] to arbitrary bounding classes $\mathcal{B}$.

In section 4, we generalize the constructions and results of section 3 to the relative context. We begin by establishing a relative version of the Brown and Bieri-Eckmann conditions used to establish homological or homotopic finiteness through a given degree. In section 4.2, we introduce the higher dimensional relative Dehn functions in several different, but equivalent ways. In section 4.3 the notion of relative $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology is developed and shown to fit into a long-exact sequence similar to the long-exact sequence in non-bounded relative group cohomology. The notion of relative $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomologicality is introduced and related to the higher relative Dehn functions. This relationship is then examined in the case of relatively hyperbolic groups and groups acting on complexes.

¹This result has also recently been obtained in [BRS], using more geometric techniques.

In section 5, we construct in $BH^*(\cdot)$ the i) Hochschild-Serre spectral sequence associated to an extension of groups with word-length, and ii) the spectral sequence associated to a group acting on a complex. These spectral sequences closely resemble their non-bounded counter-parts, and, as we mentioned above, provide the main tools for computing $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology.

Finally, in section 6, we examine specific examples, beginning with duality groups (in the sense of Bieri-Eckmann). A striking fact, proved in section 6.2, is that $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomologicality for an oriented n -dimensional Poincare Duality group G is guaranteed by the $\mathcal{B}$ -boundedness of a single cohomology class in $H^n(G \times G)$ coming from the restriction of the Thom class for the diagonal embedding, i.e., the “dual” fundamental class of G . For fundamental groups of compact oriented manifolds with connected boundary, $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomologicality is guaranteed by a $\mathcal{B}$ -bound on two separate cohomology classes. In section 6.3, we introduce the notion of a $\mathcal{B}$ -duality group, and show that when the fundamental homology class in $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded homology is in the image of the homology comparison map, the cohomology comparison map is injective for all coefficients. Finally, in sections 6.4 and 6.5, we discuss the examples mentioned in (A1.) - (A3.) above.

The second author would like to thank Ian Leary for an illuminating remark regarding [L]. The first and third authors are grateful to Denis Osin for his communications relating to complexes of groups, relative Dehn functions, and the Arzhantseva-Osin example of an exponential growth solvable group that has quadratic first Dehn function, [AO].

2 Preliminaries

We discuss some constructions and terminology that will be used throughout the paper.

2.1 Bounding Classes

Let $\mathcal{S}$ denote the set of non-decreasing functions $\{f : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+\}$. Suppose $\phi : \mathcal{S}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is a function of sets, and $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{S}$. We will say that $\mathcal{B}$ is weakly closed under the operation ϕ if for each n -tuple $(f_1, \dots, f_n) \in \mathcal{B}^n$, there exists an $f \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\phi(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n) < f$. A bounding class then is a subset of $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{S}$ satisfying

- (BC1) it contains the constant function 1,
- (BC2) it is weakly closed under the operations of taking positive rational linear combinations
- (BC3) it is weakly closed under the operation $(f, g) \mapsto f \circ g$ for $g \in \mathcal{L}$, where $\mathcal{L}$ denotes the linear bounding class $\{f(x) = ax + b \mid a, b \in \mathbb{Q}_+\}$.

Naturally occurring classes besides $\mathcal{L}$ are $\mathcal{B}_{min} = \{\mathbb{Q}_+\}$, $\mathcal{P}$ = the set of polynomials with non-negative rational coefficients, the set $\mathcal{E} = \{e^f, f \in \mathcal{L}\}$, and $\mathcal{B}_{max} = \mathcal{S}$. A bounding class is multiplicative if it is weakly closed under multiplication, and composable if it is weakly closed under composition. More generally, given bounding classes $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B}'$, we say $\mathcal{B}$ is a left resp. right $\mathcal{B}'$ -class if $\mathcal{B}$ is weakly closed under left resp. right composition with elements of $\mathcal{B}'$ (thus, for example, all bounding classes are right $\mathcal{L}$ -classes by (BC3)).

Basic properties of bounding classes were discussed in [JOR1]; for technical reasons only composable bounding classes were considered in that paper, however, all of the results of [JOR1, § 1.2] apply for this larger collection of classes. We write $\mathcal{B}' \preceq \mathcal{B}$ if every $f \in \mathcal{B}'$ is bounded above by some element $f \in \mathcal{B}$, with equivalence $\mathcal{B}' \sim \mathcal{B}$ if $\mathcal{B}' \preceq \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B} \preceq \mathcal{B}'$. Finally, $\mathcal{B}' \prec \mathcal{B}$ if $\mathcal{B}' \preceq \mathcal{B}$ but $\mathcal{B}'$ is not equivalent to $\mathcal{B}$.

Given a weighted set (X, w) and $f \in \mathcal{S}$, the seminorm $\|\cdot\|_f$ on $\text{Hom}(X, \mathbb{C})$ is given by $\|\phi\|_f := \sum_{x \in X} |\phi(x)|f(w(x))$. Then $H_{\mathcal{B}, w}(X) = \{f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \mid \|\phi\|_f < \infty \forall f \in \mathcal{B}\}$. The most important feature of $H_{\mathcal{B}, w}(X)$ is that it is an algebra whenever X is a semi-group and w is sub-additive with respect to the multiplication on X . If X has a unit, then

so does $H_{\mathcal{B},w}(X)$. We will mainly be concerned with the case $(X, w) = (G, L)$ is a discrete group equipped with a length function L (meaning a function $L : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ subadditive with respect to the multiplication on G , and invariant under the involution $g \mapsto g^{-1}$). The length function L is called a word-length function (with respect to a generating set S) if $L(1) = 1$ and there is a function $\phi : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ with

$$L(g) = \min \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(x_i) \mid x_i \in S, x_1 x_2 \dots x_n = g \right\}$$

When the generating set S is finite, taking $\phi = 1$ produces the standard word-length function on G .

2.2 The FP^α and HF^α conditions

In this paper the term complex will refer either to a simplicial complex, polyhedral complex, or simplicial set. For a complex X , we say X is type HF^α ($\alpha \leq \infty$) if $|X| \simeq |Y|$ where Y is a CW complex with finitely many cells through dimension α . This notion clearly defines an equivalence relation on the appropriate category of complexes, and admits an equivariant formulation: for a discrete group G which acts either cellularly or simplicially, a G -complex X is type $G - HF^\alpha$ if there is a strong G -homotopy equivalence $X \simeq Y$ with Y having finitely many G -orbits through dimension α . A group G is type HF^α if its classifying space BG is type HF^α , or equivalently, if EG is type $G - HF^\alpha$.

When α is finite and X is a simplicial complex resp. simplicial set resp. polyhedral complex, the HF^α condition is equivalent to saying $X \simeq Y$ a simplicial complex resp. simplicial set resp. polyhedral complex with $Y^{(\alpha)}$ finite. When $\alpha = \infty$ and X is a polyhedral complex, then X is type HF^∞ iff $X \simeq Y$ a polyhedral complex with $Y^{(n)}$ finite for all $n < \infty$. However, if X is either a simplicial set or simplicial complex, the HF^∞ condition is equivalent to the weaker statement $X \simeq Y = \varinjlim Y_n$ a direct limit of simplicial sets resp. simplicial subcomplexes, with the inclusion $Y_n \hookrightarrow Y$ inducing an n -connected map of spaces $|Y_n| \hookrightarrow |Y|$.

For discrete groups, the condition HF^α is equivalent to requiring that G is finitely-presented and type FP^α . The standard FP^α condition - that $\mathbb{Z}$ admits a resolution

over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ which is finitely-generated projective through dimension α - is now known to be strictly weaker than requiring G to be HF^α when G is not finitely-presented. Because the framework used in this paper for defining Dehn functions is algebraic, our primary focus will be on discrete groups of type FP^α . Again, we remind the reader that FP^α is equivalent to FF^α - the condition that $\mathbb{Z}$ admits a resolution over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ by free $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ -modules which are finitely-generated through dimension α

2.3 $\mathcal{B}$ -homology and $\mathcal{B}$ -cohomology of algebras

There are a number of different settings in which one can develop the theory of $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology for non-discrete algebras. For arbitrary $\mathcal{B}$, the most natural is the bornological framework introduced by [M2, M3]. Given a bornological algebra A and bornological A -modules M and N , the derived functors $\mathrm{Tor}_*^A(M, N)$ and $\mathrm{Ext}_A^*(M, N)$ are computed in the bornological category using standard constructions from homological algebra, with the constraint that projective or injective resolutions used are contractible via a bounded linear contraction.

Before defining homology and cohomology, we want to point out that in both cases there is a “bornologically correct” reduced theory and an “algebraically correct” unreduced theory. In general, given a chain complex (C_*, d_*) , or a cocomplex (D^*, d^*) , of bornological vector spaces with bounded differential, we distinguish between the algebraic (co)homology groups

$$H_*^a(C_*) := \{H_n(C_*) = \ker(d_n)/\mathrm{im}(d_{n+1})\}, \quad H_a^*(D^*) := \{H^n(D^*) = \ker(d^n)/\mathrm{im}(d^{n-1})\}$$

and the bornological (co)homology groups

$$H_*^b(C_*) := \{H_n(C_*) = \ker(d_n)/\overline{\mathrm{im}(d_{n+1})}\}, \quad H_b^*(D^*) := \{H^n(D^*) = \ker(d^n)/\overline{\mathrm{im}(d^{n-1})}\}$$

Thus given a bornological algebra with unit A , bornological A -modules M_1, M_2 , projective resolutions $P_\bullet^i$ of M_i over A , and an injective resolution $Q_\bullet$ of M_2 over A

$$(1) \quad \mathrm{Tor}_*^{A,x}(M_1, M_2) := H_*^x(P_\bullet^1 \hat{\otimes}_A M_2) = H_*^x(M_1 \hat{\otimes}_A P_\bullet^2), \quad x = a, b$$

$$(2) \quad \mathrm{Ext}_{A,x}^*(M_1, M_2) := H_x^*(\mathrm{Hom}_A^{bdd}(P_\bullet^1, M_2)) = H_x^*(\mathrm{Hom}_A^{bdd}(M_1, Q_\bullet)), \quad x = a, b$$

Here $\text{Hom}_A^{bdd}(-)$ denotes (in each degree) the bornological vector space of bounded A -module homomorphisms. In cohomology, there are two other intermediate groups one can define:

$$L\text{Ext}_{A,a}^*(M_1, M_2) := H_a^*(\text{Hom}_A(P_\bullet^1, M_2)) \quad R\text{Ext}_{A,a}^*(M_1, M_2) := H_a^*(\text{Hom}_A(M_1, Q_\bullet))$$

where $\text{Hom}_A^{bdd}(-)$ is replaced degreewise by the larger $\text{Hom}_A(-)$ consisting of all A -linear maps, forgetting the bornology. This is equivalent to re-bornologizing in each degree with the fine bornology (after forming the resolution using the original bornology), and then computing Ext . Finally, one has the purely algebraic groups. Let B^δ denote B equipped with the fine bornology. Let $R_\bullet^i$ denote a projective resolution of M_1^δ over A^δ , and $S_\bullet$ an injective resolution of M_2^δ over A^δ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tor}_*^{A^\delta}(M_1^\delta, M_2^\delta) &:= H_*(R_\bullet^1 \otimes_{A^\delta} M_2^\delta) = H_*(M_1^\delta \otimes_{A^\delta} R_\bullet^2) \\ \text{Ext}_{A^\delta}^*(M_1^\delta, M_2^\delta) &:= H^*(\text{Hom}_{A^\delta}(R_\bullet^1, M_2^\delta)) = H^*(\text{Hom}_{A^\delta}(M_1^\delta, S_\bullet)) \end{aligned}$$

We remark that this definition applies as well when M_i are differential graded (aka DG) bornological A -modules, by which we mean DG objects in the category of bornological A -modules.

2.4 $\mathcal{B}$ -homology and $\mathcal{B}$ -cohomology of weighted complexes

A weight function on a set S is a map of sets $w : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. Fix a weighted set (S, w) , and write $\mathbb{C}[S]$ for the vector space over $\mathbb{C}$ with basis S . For a bounding class $\mathcal{B}$, we may define seminorms on $\mathbb{C}[S]$ by

$$\left| \sum_{s \in S} \alpha_s s \right|_f := \sum_{s \in S} |\alpha_s| f(w(s)), \quad f \in \mathcal{B}$$

If (G, L) is a discrete group with length function L , a weighted G -set is a weighted set (S, w) with a G -action on S satisfying

$$(3) \quad w(gs) \leq C \cdot L(g) + w(s), \quad \forall g \in G, s \in S$$

Let $H_{\mathcal{B},w}(S)$ denote the completion of $\mathbb{C}[S]$ with respect to the seminorms in (3). Then $H_{\mathcal{B},w}(S)$ may be viewed as a bornological vector space, which is Frechet if there exists a countable bounding class $\mathcal{B}'$ with $\mathcal{B} \sim \mathcal{B}'$. Note that $\mathbb{C}[S]$ is a module over $\mathbb{C}[G]$ in the usual way: $(\sum \lambda_i g_i)(\sum \beta_j s_j) = \sum_{i,j} \lambda_i \beta_j g_i s_j$.

Proposition 1 *The module structure of $\mathbb{C}[S]$ over the group algebra $\mathbb{C}[G]$ extends to a bounded bornological $H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module structure on $H_{\mathcal{B},w}(S)$.*

Proof This follows by the same estimates as those used to show $H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ is an algebra:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left| \left(\sum \lambda_{g_1} g_1 \right) \left(\sum \lambda_{g_2} s_2 \right) \right|_f \\
 &= \sum_{s \in S} \left| \sum_{g_1 s_2 = s} \lambda_{g_1} \lambda_{s_2} \right| f(w(s)) \\
 &\leq \sum_{s \in S} \left(\sum_{g_1 s_2 = s} |\lambda_{g_1} \lambda_{s_2}| f(L(g_1) + w(s_2)) \right) \\
 &\leq \sum_{s \in S} \left(\sum_{g_1 s_2 = s, L(g_1) \leq w(s_2)} |\lambda_{g_1} \lambda_{s_2}| f(2w(s_2)) \right) + \sum_{s \in S} \left(\sum_{g_1 s_2 = s, w(s_2) \leq L(g_1)} |\lambda_{g_1} \lambda_{s_2}| f(2L(g_1)) \right) \\
 &\leq \left| \sum \lambda_{g_1} g_1 \right|_1 \left| \sum \lambda_{s_2} s_2 \right|_{f_2} + \left| \sum \lambda_{g_1} g_1 \right|_{f_2} \left| \sum \lambda_{s_2} s_2 \right|_1 < \infty
 \end{aligned}$$

where $|\cdot|_1$ denotes the ℓ^1 -norm, and $f_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ is any function satisfying $f(2x) \leq f_2(x) \forall x$. $\square$

A weighted simplicial set, respectively weighted simplicial complex, (X, w) is a simplicial set, respectively a simplicial complex, $X = \{X_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ together with weight functions $w_n : X_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for each n and n -simplex σ , $w_{n-1}(\sigma') \leq w_n(\sigma)$ when σ' is a face of σ , and (in the case of simplicial sets) $w_{n+1}(s_j(\sigma)) = w_n(\sigma)$ where s_j represents a degeneracy map². In both cases, we will simply refer to (X, w) as a weighted complex. Given a discrete group with length (G, L) , a weighted G -complex is a G -complex weighted in such a way that for each n , the action of G on (X_n, w_n) satisfies equation (3) above. In this case, completing $C_*(X)$ degree-wise produces a bornological chain complex

$$\mathcal{B}C_*(X) := \{H_{\mathcal{B},w_n}(X_n), d_n\}_{n \geq 0}$$

When the action of G on X is free, the definition of the G -equivariant $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology of X with coefficients in a bornological $H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module A is

$$(4) \quad \mathcal{B}H_{G,x}^*(X; A) := H_x^*(\text{Hom}_{H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{\text{cont}}(\mathcal{B}C_*(X)_*, A)), \quad x = a, b$$

$$(5) \quad \mathcal{B}H_*^{G,x}(X; A) := H_*^x(\mathcal{B}C_*(X) \hat{\otimes}_{H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)} A), \quad x = a, b$$

²The same definition applies to polyhedral complexes, under a mild restriction on the number of faces allowed in each dimension.

Note that $\text{Hom}_{H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{B}C_*(X)_*, A) = \text{Hom}_{H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{B}C_*(X)_*, A)^G$, and $\mathcal{B}C_*(X) \hat{\otimes}_{H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)} A$ identifies with the quotient of $\mathcal{B}C_*(X) \hat{\otimes} A$ by the closure of the image of $\{Id - g \mid g \in G\}$ where $g \circ (x \otimes y) = (gx \otimes g^{-1}y)$. In general when the action of G is not free, the definition is adjusted in the usual way by first replacing these G -fixed-point and G -orbit spaces by the larger equivariant “homotopy fixed-point” and “homotopy-orbit” spaces. Let EG denote the homogeneous bar resolution of G , with weight function $w(g_0, \dots, g_n) = L(g_0) + \sum_{i=1}^n L(g_{i-1}^{-1}g_i)$. Then³

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{B}C_*(X)_*, A)^{hG} &:= \text{Hom}_{H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{B}C_*(EG), \text{Hom}_{H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{B}C_*(X)_*, A)) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{B}C_*(EG) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{B}C_*(X)_*, A) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{B}C_*(EG \times X)_*, A); \\ (\mathcal{B}C_*(X) \hat{\otimes} A)_{hG} &:= (\mathcal{B}C_*(EG) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{B}C_*(X)_*) \hat{\otimes}_{H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)} A \\ &\cong \mathcal{B}C_*(EG \times X)_* \hat{\otimes}_{H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)} A \end{aligned}$$

The G -equivariant $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology groups of the weighted complex (X, w) with coefficients in the $H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module A are given as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}H_{G,x}^*(X; A) &:= H_x^*(\text{Hom}_{H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{B}C_*(X)_*, A)^{hG}), \quad x = a, b \\ \mathcal{B}H_*^{G,x}(X; A) &:= H_*^x(\mathcal{B}C_*(X) \hat{\otimes} A)_{hG}, \quad x = a, b \end{aligned}$$

When the action of G on X is free, these groups agree with those defined above. They also agree with those given in the previous section in terms of derived functors; they are simply equalities (1) and (2) where M_1 is the (DG) $H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module $\mathcal{B}C_*(X)$. In this context,

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{B}H_{G,x}^*(X; A) = \text{Ext}_{H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G),x}^*(\mathcal{B}C_*(X), A)$$

$$(7) \quad \mathcal{B}H_*^{G,x}(X; A) = \text{Tor}_*^{H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G),x}(\mathcal{B}C_*(X), A)$$

with $\mathcal{B}C_*(EG \times X)$ used as a canonical free resolution of $\mathcal{B}C_*(X)$ over $H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ when $\mathcal{B}C_*(X)$ is not free over $H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ (i.e., when the action of G on X is not free). the inclusion of complexes

$$C_*(EG \times X) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}C_*(EG \times X)$$

³the isomorphism of complexes $\mathcal{B}C_*(EG) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{B}C_*(X)_* \cong \mathcal{B}C_*(EG \times X)_*$ is a special case of a more general equivalence to be established in [JOR3].

induces comparison maps

$$(8) \quad \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^* : \mathcal{B}H_{G,x}^*(X; A) \rightarrow H_G^*(X; A)$$

$$(9) \quad \Phi_x^{\mathcal{B}} : H_*^G(X; A) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}H_*^{G,x}(X; A)$$

which are clearly functorial in X , G , and A .

The $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology groups of (X, w) are computed as the cohomology of a subcomplex of $C^*(EG \times X; A)^G$ which can be difficult to describe in general. However, when the action of G is free on X and trivial on A , and A is simply a normed vector space (e.g., $\mathbb{C}$), then

$$\mathcal{B}H_{G,x}^*(X; A) = \mathcal{B}H_x^*(X/G; A) = H_x^*(\mathcal{B}C^*(X/G; A))$$

where

$$(10) \quad \mathcal{B}C^*(X/G; A) = \{\mathcal{B}C^n(X/G; A)\}_{n \geq 0}$$

$$(11) \quad \mathcal{B}C^n(X/G; A) = \{\phi : (X/G)_n \rightarrow A \mid \exists f \in \mathcal{B} \text{ s.t. } |\phi(\bar{x})| < f(\overline{w}(\bar{x})) \quad \forall \bar{x} \in (X/G)_n\}$$

2.5 Dehn functions

There are two basic environments in which one can consider (higher) Dehn functions. We discuss both.

2.5.1 The geometric setting

Suppose X is a weakly contractible complex, with boundary map ∂ . Any loop α in $X^{(1)}$ bounds a disk β in $X^{(2)}$, $\partial\beta = \alpha$. Denote the number of n -cells in a complex W by $\|W\|_n$. Set $\text{Vol}_2(\alpha) = \min \|\beta\|_2$, where this minimum is taken over all disks β in $X^{(2)}$ with $\partial\beta = \alpha$. More generally, if $f : \alpha \rightarrow X$ is a mapping of a combinatorial n -sphere to X , there is a map of an $(n+1)$ -ball $h : \beta \rightarrow X^{(n+1)}$ with $\partial h = f$, and the filling volume of f is $\text{Vol}_{n+1}(f) = \min \|\beta\|_{n+1}$, where this minimum is taken over all combinatorial maps of $(n+1)$ -balls $h : \beta \rightarrow X$ with boundary f . For each n , the n^{th} geometric Dehn function of X , $d_X^n : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, is defined via the formula

$$d_X^n(k) := \max \text{Vol}_{n+1}(f)$$

where the maximum is taken over all combinatorial maps f of n -spheres $f : \alpha \rightarrow X$ with $\|f\|_n \leq k$. In the case $n = 1$, d_X^1 is often referred to as simply ‘the’ geometric Dehn function of the complex. These Dehn functions give a measurement of the filling volume of cycles in X , with d_X^n being the n^{th} unweighted Dehn function of X . Of course, these functions do not exist if the corresponding maximum values do not exist.

When X comes equipped with a weight w on its cells, there is definition of geometric Dehn function which takes that weight into account. Given a complex W and combinatorial map $f : W \rightarrow X$, denote by $\|f\|_{w,n}$ the sum $\sum_{\sigma \in W^{(n)}} w(f(\sigma))$. For a map $f : \alpha \rightarrow X$ of a combinatorial n -sphere α to X , denote the weighted filling volume of f by $\text{Vol}_{w,n}(f) = \min \|h\|_{w,n+1}$, where this minimum is taken over all maps $h : \beta \rightarrow X$ of combinatorial $(n+1)$ -balls to X with boundary f . For each n , the n^{th} weighted geometric Dehn function of X , $d_X^{w,n} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, is defined via the formula

$$d_X^{w,n}(k) := \max \text{Vol}_{w,n+1}(f)$$

where the maximum is taken over all combinatorial maps $f : \alpha \rightarrow X$ of n -spheres to X with $\|f\|_{w,n} \leq k$. If the weight of each cell is set to one, then d_X^n and $d_X^{w,n}$ are equal [Note: For certain choices of weights, the geometric and weighted geometric Dehn functions may be comparable. In general, however, if X has geometric Dehn functions and weighted geometric Dehn functions defined in all dimensions, there need not be any particular relation between the two. If the weight function in each degree is a proper function on the set of simplices, the weighted geometric Dehn functions exist in all dimensions. In general, however, the weighted geometric Dehn functions may fail to exist if the weight function fails to be proper in one or more dimensions].

Assume a non-weighted weakly contractible complex X admits an action by a finitely generated group G which is proper and cocompact on all finite skeleta. Then $\{d_X^n\}_{n \geq 0}$ are referred to as the geometric Dehn functions of G and denoted $\{d_G^n\}_{n \geq 0}$. There is a natural way to weight X so that the weighted geometric Dehn functions encode information about the group action. Fix a basepoint $x_0 \in X^{(0)}$. For a vertex $v \in X^{(0)}$, set $w_X(v) := d_X^{(1)}(x_0, v)$, the distance from v to the basepoint in the 1-skeleton of X , where each edge in the 1-skeleton is assumed to have length 1. For an n -cell $\sigma \in X^{(n)}$ with vertices $(v_0, \dots, v_k)$, let $w_X(\sigma) := \sum_{i=1}^k w_X(v_i)$, the sum of the weights of the vertices. Changing basepoints yields different weight functions, but if for each n there is a bound on the number of vertices an n -cell can possess, then the two weight functions will be linearly equivalent. We refer to this choice of assigning weights to cells as the 1-skeleton weighting. For this choice of weight on X there is, for each

$n \geq 0$, a constant K_n with

$$w_X(g \cdot \sigma) \leq K_n \cdot \ell_G(g) + w_X(\sigma)$$

for all n -cells σ (compare to (3) above), where ℓ_G denotes the word-length function of G with respect to some fixed finite generating set. In this case, the G -action can be used to compare d_X^n with $d_X^{w,n}$. Up to equivalence, one has [JR1, Lemmas 2.3, 2.4]

$$(12) \quad d_X^{w,n}(k) \leq (d_X^n(k))^2, \quad d_X^n(k) \leq k d_X^{w,n}(k^2)$$

2.5.2 The algebraic setting

In the literature, it is the geometric Dehn functions that have received the most attention. Our focus, however, will be on the homological version of the above constructions. Suppose (C_*, d_*) is an acyclic chain complex of free $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules. Denote by $\{v_i \mid i \in \mathcal{I}\}$, a basis of C_n over $\mathbb{Z}$. Given an element $\alpha = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i v_i$ of C_* , set $\|\alpha\|_n := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |\lambda_i|$. For $\alpha \in C_n$ a cycle, let $\text{Vol}_{n+1}(\alpha) := \min \|\beta\|_{n+1}$, where this minimum is taken over all $\beta \in C_{n+1}$ with $d_{n+1}(\beta) = \alpha$. Define a function $d_C^n : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by

$$d_C^n(k) := \max \{ \text{Vol}_{n+1}(\alpha) \mid d_n(\alpha) = 0, \|\alpha\|_n \leq k \}$$

The function d_C^n is the n^{th} unweighted homological Dehn function of C_* . These Dehn functions measure the filling complexity of the chain complex C_* . As before, these Dehn functions do not exist if the corresponding maximum values do not exist.

When the C_n come equipped with a weight function w on its basis, homological Dehn functions can be defined so as to take that weight into account. For $\alpha = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i v_i$, let $\|\alpha\|_{w,n} := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |\lambda_i| w(v_i)$. If α is a cycle, the weighted filling volume of α is $\text{Vol}_{w,n+1}(\alpha) := \min \|\beta\|_{w,n+1}$, where this minimum is taken over all $\beta \in C_{n+1}$ with $d_{n+1}(\beta) = \alpha$. Define the n^{th} weighted Dehn function of C_* , $d_C^{w,n} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, by

$$d_C^{w,n}(k) := \max \{ \text{Vol}_{w,n+1}(\alpha) \mid d_n(\alpha) = 0, \|\alpha\|_{w,n} \leq k \}$$

If the weight of each basis element is set to one, then $d_C^n = d_C^{w,n}$. For certain choices of weights, the unweighted and the weighted Dehn functions may be comparable. In general, however, no relationship needs exist between the two.

Now suppose G is an FP^∞ group equipped with word-length function L , and C_* is a resolution of $\mathbb{Z}$ over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ which in each degree is a finitely generated free module over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$. In this case, the collection $\{d_C^n\}$ are referred to as the Dehn functions of G , denoted d_G^n . We will call the resolution C_* k -nice ($k \leq \infty$) if

- for each finite $n \leq k$, $C_n = \mathbb{Z}[G][T_n]$ for some finite weighted set (T_n, w_n^T) ;
- for each finite $n \geq 0$, S_n (= the orbit of T_n under the free action of G) is equipped with a proper weight function w_n^S satisfying

$$C_{1,n}L(g) + w_n^T(t) \leq w_n^S(gt) \leq C_{2,n}L(g) + w_n^T(t) \quad \forall g \in G, t \in T_n$$

for positive constants $C_{1,n} \leq C_{2,n}$ depending only on n ;

- for each finite n , $d_n^C : C_n \rightarrow C_{n-1}$ is linearly bounded with respect to the weight functions on C_n and C_{n-1} .

The term “nice” will refer to the case $k = \infty$. The weighted Dehn functions of G (through dimension k if k is finite) are given by $\{d_G^{w,n} := d_C^{w,n}\}_{n < k}$ where C_* is a k -nice resolution of $\mathbb{Z}$ over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$. Both d_G^n and $d_G^{w,n}$ are independent of the particular choice of k -nice resolution used in their definition, up to linear equivalence. For such resolutions, the fact T_n is finite for each finite $n \leq k$ means that the linear equivalence classes of the Dehn functions $\{d_G^{w,n}\}$ are independent of the choice of weightings on $\{T_n\}$. Finally, a resolution D_* of $\mathbb{C}$ over $\mathbb{C}[G]$ is k -nice resp. nice if it is of the form $D_* = C_* \otimes \mathbb{C}$ where C_* is a k -nice resp. nice resolution of $\mathbb{Z}$ over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$.

Lemma 1 *Let G be an FP^k group equipped with word-length function L , C_* a k -nice resolution of $\mathbb{Z}$ over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$, $D_* = C_* \otimes \mathbb{C}$, and $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B}'$ bounding classes. Suppose that the weight w on the weighted set underlying C_* takes no value in $(0, 1)$. Denote by $\mathcal{B}D_*$ the corresponding Frechet completion of D_* with respect to the bounding class $\mathcal{B}$, as defined above. Further suppose that the weighted Dehn functions $\{d_C^{w,n}\}$ are $\mathcal{B}'$ -bounded in dimensions $n < k$, that $\mathcal{B}$ is a right $\mathcal{B}'$ -class, and that $\mathcal{B} \succeq \mathcal{L}$. Then there exists a bounded chain null-homotopy $\{s_{n+1} : \mathcal{B}D_n \rightarrow \mathcal{B}D_{n+1}\}_{k > n \geq 0}$, implying $\mathcal{B}D_*$ is a continuous resolution of $\mathbb{C}$ over $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ through dimension k .*

Proof Note first that the “niceness” of C_* guarantees that boundary map $d_n^C : C_n \rightarrow C_{n-1}$ extends to a continuous boundary map $d_n : \mathcal{B}D_n \rightarrow \mathcal{B}D_{n-1}$. We will prove the lemma in three steps.

Claim 1 For each $k > n \geq 1$, there exists a function $f_n \in \mathcal{B}'$ so that for all $\alpha \in \ker(d_n^C)$ and $h \in \mathcal{B}$, there exists $\beta_\alpha \in C_{n+1}$ with $d_n^C(\beta_\alpha) = \alpha$, and $|\beta_\alpha|_h \leq (h \circ f_n)(\|\alpha\|_{w,n})$.

Proof. The hypothesis on $\{d_C^{w,n}\}$ implies that for each $n < k$ there exists $f_n \in \mathcal{B}'$ with

$$\text{Vol}_{w,n+1}(\alpha) \leq f_n(\|\alpha\|_{w,n}) \quad \forall \alpha \in \ker(d_n^C)$$

Then for $\alpha = \sum m_{ij}g_it_j \in \ker(d_n^C)$, we may choose $\beta_\alpha = \sum n_{kl}g_k s_l \in C_{n+1}$ with $d_{n+1}^C(\beta_\alpha) = \alpha$ and

$$\|\beta_\alpha\|_{w,n+1} = \sum |n_{kl}|w_{n+1}(g_k s_l) \leq f_n \left(\sum |m_{ij}|w_n(g_it_j) \right) = f_n(\|\alpha\|_{w,n})$$

Since $\mathcal{B} \succeq \mathcal{L}$, we may assume that $h \in \mathcal{B}$ is super-additive on the interval $[1, \infty)$. One then has

$$\begin{aligned} |\beta_\alpha|_h &= \left| \sum n_{kl}g_k s_l \right|_h \\ &:= \sum |n_{kl}|h(w_{n+1}(g_k s_l)) \\ &\leq h \left(\sum |n_{kl}|w(g_k s_l) \right) \quad \text{by the super-additivity of } h \\ &= h \left(\|\beta_\alpha\|_{w,n+1} \right) \\ &\leq (h \circ f_n)(\|\alpha\|_{w,n}) \end{aligned}$$

//

Claim 2 For each $k > n \geq -1$ there exists a $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded linear section $s_{n+1}^C : C_n \rightarrow C_{n+1}$ satisfying $d_{n+1}^C s_{n+1}^C + s_n^C d_n^C = Id$.

Proof. The case $n = -1$ is trivial since any basis element of C_0 determines a linear injection $\mathbb{Z} = C_{-1} \rightarrow C_0$ which is bounded. Assume s_n^C has been defined. Let $p_n = (Id - s_n^C d_n^C) : C_n \rightarrow \ker(d_n^C)$; this projection onto $\ker(d_n^C)$ is bounded via the boundedness of s_n . Thus we may find an $f'_n \in \mathcal{B}'$ with $\|p_n(x)\|_{w,n} \leq f'_n(\|x\|_{w,n})$ for all $x \in C_n$. Let $f''_n = f_n \circ f'_n$. For each basis element $g_it_j \in C_n$, set $s_{n+1}^C(g_it_j) = \beta_{p_n(g_it_j)}$, as defined in the above Claim. Then for each super-additive $h \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |s_{n+1}^C(g_it_j)|_h &= |\beta_{p_n(g_it_j)}|_h \\ &\leq (h \circ f_n)(\|p_n(g_it_j)\|_{w,n}) \\ &\leq (h \circ f_n \circ f'_n)(\|g_it_j\|_{w,n}) = (h \circ f''_n)(w_n(g_it_j)) \end{aligned}$$

Extending s_{n+1}^C linearly to all of C_n yields the desired result.

//

Claim 3 For each $k > n \geq -1$, the linear extension of s_{n+1}^C to D_n yields a $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded linear map $s_{n+1}^D : D_n \rightarrow D_{n+1}$.

Proof. This follows from the sequence of inequalities

$$\left| s_{n+1}^D \left(\sum \lambda_{ij}g_it_j \right) \right|_h$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum |\lambda_{ij}| |s_{n+1}^C(g_i t_j)|_h \\
&\leq \sum |\lambda_{ij}| |g_i t_j|_{h \circ f_n''} \\
&= \left| \sum \lambda_{ij} g_i t_j \right|_{h \circ f_n''}
\end{aligned}$$

//

This completes the proof of the lemma. We should note that the definition of weighted Dehn function could be considered for more general resolutions of $\mathbb{C}$ over $\mathbb{C}[G]$ which do not arise from tensoring a nice resolution of $\mathbb{Z}$ over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ with $\mathbb{C}$. However, for this more general class, it is likely that the statement of this lemma no longer holds true. $\square$

It appears that not allowing your proper weight function w to take values in $(0, 1)$ is restrictive, it is always possible to find a linearly equivalent proper weight function w' which takes values in $\mathbb{Z}_+$. While the weight structure may change slightly, the completions arising from using the two weights will agree. In many cases, for example the 1-skeleton weighting discussed above and in [O2], the naturally occurring weight function is integral-valued.

In the proof of Claim 1 above, the existence of a function $h \in \mathcal{B}$ which was superadditive on $[0, 1)$. To this end suppose f and g are differentiable functions, and consider the following property:

There exists a $C \geq 0$ such that for all $x \geq C$

$$f(g(x)) \geq g(f(x)).$$

A sufficient set of conditions to guarantee this is:

- (1) $f(g(C)) \geq g(f(C))$.
- (2) $[fg(x)]' \geq [gf(x)]'$.

Restrict to the case where g is the linear function $g(x) = rx$, for $r \geq 1$ a real number. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
(f(g(x)))' &= (f(rx))' = rf'(rx) \\
(g(f(x)))' &= rf'(x)
\end{aligned}$$

In this case condition (2) is just the requirement that $f'(rx) \geq f'(x)$, $r \geq 1$, i.e., that f' is non-decreasing. If $f(0)$ is required to be > 0 , then taking, say, $C = 1$ this condition

becomes $f(r) \geq rf(1)$. If $\mathcal{B} \succeq \mathcal{L}$, this shows that $\mathcal{B}$ contains functions which are superadditive when restricted to $[1, \infty)$.

Corollary 1 *Let G be a finitely generated group acting properly and cocompactly on a contractible polyhedral complex X , with finitely many orbits in each dimension, and endowed with the 1-skeleton weighting. If the integral polyhedral chain complex, $C_n(X; \mathbb{Z})$, admits $\mathcal{B}'$ bounded weighted Dehn functions and $\mathcal{B}$ is a right $\mathcal{B}'$ -class, then the Frechet completion $\mathcal{B}C_n(X; \mathbb{C})$ gives a continuous resolution of $\mathbb{C}$ over $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$. In particular if $C_n(X; \mathbb{Z})$ admits polynomially bounded weighted Dehn functions, so does $C_n(X; \mathbb{C})$.*

Remarks

- It is a result due to Gersten that for finitely-presented groups, the first algebraic and first geometric Dehn functions are equivalent. However, in dimensions greater than one, it is not at all clear if such a relation persists even when both types are defined. The one case in which one can prove an equivalence is when there is a $G - HF^\infty$ model for EG admitting an appropriate “coning” operation in all dimensions with explicitly computable bounds on the number and weights of the simplices used in coning off a simplex of one lower dimension (such is the case when G is asynchronously combable - see below).
- For finitely generated groups, word-hyperbolicity is equivalent to having d_G^1 bounded by a linear function. Hyperbolic groups provide interesting phenomena in the context of Dehn functions. A prime example is the isoperimetric gap. If d_G^1 is bounded by a function of the form n^r with $r < 2$, then d_G^1 is bounded by a linear function [Gr, Ol]. In particular if G is not hyperbolic, then d_G^1 must be at least quadratic. On the other hand, it is well known that for a hyperbolic group G , the functions d_G^n are linearly bounded in every dimension n . The geometric characterization of the isocohomological property discussed in Section 3.2 below implies that $d_G^{w,n}$ are all linearly bounded Dehn functions, providing a bounded version of the FP^α condition described above.

This idea of combining boundedness with the FP^k condition is made precise by

Definition 1 *Given a bounding class $\mathcal{B}$ and a group with word-length (G, L) , we say G is of type $\mathcal{B}FP^k$ ($k \leq \infty$) if it is of type FP^k , and the completion $\mathcal{B}D_*$ of a k -nice resolution D_* of $\mathbb{C}$ over $\mathbb{C}[G]$ admits a bounded linear chain contraction through dimension k (or in all finite dimensions if $k = \infty$).*

2.6 Products, coproducts and pairing operations

Throughout this section we assume $\mathcal{B}$ is multiplicative. Let (X, w_X) and (Y, w_Y) be a weighted simplicial sets. Then their product $(X \times Y, w_X \times w_Y)$ is again a weighted simplicial set, where $X \times Y$ is equipped with diagonal simplicial structure. It follows from the definition of a weighted complex that the Alexander-Whitney map

$$\Delta_{AS} : C_*(X \times Y) \rightarrow C_*(X) \otimes C_*(Y)$$

is uniformly bounded above in each dimension n by a linear function of n . As a result, this chain map extends to a chain map⁴

$$\mathcal{B}\Delta_{AS} : \mathcal{B}C_*(X \times Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}C_*(X) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{B}C_*(Y)$$

The shuffle product map in the other direction

$$\nabla : C_*(X) \otimes C_*(Y) \rightarrow C_*(X \times Y)$$

is uniformly bounded in the same way, yielding a chain map $\mathcal{B}C_*(X) \otimes \mathcal{B}C_*(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(X \times Y)$ which is bi-bounded, and therefore factors as

$$(13) \quad \mathcal{B}\nabla : \mathcal{B}C_*(X) \otimes \mathcal{B}C_*(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}C_*(X) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{B}C_*(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}C_*(X \times Y)$$

The following is a special case of a more general equivalence that will appear in [JOR3].

Theorem 1 (Kunneth Theorem) *For all weighted simplicial sets (X, w_X) , (Y, w_Y) , $\mathcal{B}\Delta_{AS} \circ \mathcal{B}\nabla = id$, while $\mathcal{B}\nabla \circ \mathcal{B}\Delta_{AS} \simeq id$ by a $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded homotopy natural with respect to morphisms of weighted sets, resulting in bornological chain equivalences*

$$(14) \quad \mathcal{B}C_*(X) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{B}C_*(Y) \simeq \mathcal{B}C_*(X \times Y)$$

$$(15) \quad \mathcal{B}C^*(X \times Y) \simeq \mathcal{B}C^*(X) \otimes \mathcal{B}C^*(Y)$$

In fact, the equality $\mathcal{B}\Delta_{AS} \circ \mathcal{B}\nabla = id$ follows from the the classical identity $\Delta_{AS} \circ \nabla = id$ by continuity. The second equality follows the classical proof via acyclic models, refined so as to accommodate the weight function.

Interestingly, even though in general there is no DG coassociative coalgebra structure on $\mathcal{B}H_*(X)$, there is a DG associative algebra structure on $\mathcal{B}H_x^*(X)$ for $x = a$, as Theorem 1 produces an isomorphism

$$(16) \quad \mathcal{B}H_a^*(X \times Y) \cong \mathcal{B}H_a^*(X) \otimes \mathcal{B}H_a^*(Y)$$

⁴In general this map will not factor by the algebraic tensor product unless either X or Y is finite in each degree

by which one can construct a cup-product operation on $\mathcal{B}H_a^*(X)$ in the usual way. It is not clear if the groups $\mathcal{B}H_b^*(X)$ admit a similar product structure in the cases where $\mathcal{B}H_a^*(X) \neq \mathcal{B}H_b^*(X)$. For this reason, we adopt the following convention for the remainder of the paper

Convention 1 *Unless otherwise indicated, $\mathcal{B}H^*(-)$ will mean $\mathcal{B}H_a^*(-)$; more generally, $\mathcal{B}H_G^*(-)$ will mean $\mathcal{B}H_{G,a}^*(-)$.*

From the definitions of $H^*(-)$ and $H_*(-)$ there is an obvious Kronecker-Delta pairing

$$\mathcal{B}H^*(X) \otimes \mathcal{B}H_*(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \quad (c, d) \mapsto \langle c, d \rangle, \quad x = a, b$$

More generally, an analysis of the standard cap product operation on the chain and cochain level yields a cap product operation

$$\mathcal{B}H^*(X) \otimes \mathcal{B}H_*(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}H_*(X), \quad (c, d) \mapsto c \cap d, \quad x = a, b$$

Finally, via the shuffle product map in (13), we have a slant-product operation

$$\mathcal{B}H^*(X \times Y) \otimes \mathcal{B}H_*(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}H^*(X), \quad (c, d) \mapsto c/d, \quad x = a, b$$

These operations satisfy the appropriate commuting diagrams with respect to the comparison map $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^*$ and $\Phi_*^{\mathcal{B}}$, leading to the identities

$$(17) \quad \langle \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^*(c), d \rangle = \langle c, \Phi_*^{\mathcal{B}}(d) \rangle, \quad c \in \mathcal{B}H^*(X), \quad d \in H_*(X)$$

$$(18) \quad \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^*(c)/d = c/\Phi_*^{\mathcal{B}}(d), \quad c \in \mathcal{B}H^*(X \times Y), \quad d \in H_*(Y)$$

$$(19) \quad \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^*(c) \cap d = c \cap \Phi_*^{\mathcal{B}}(d), \quad c \in \mathcal{B}H^*(X), \quad d \in H_*(X)$$

3 $\mathcal{B}$ cohomology of discrete groups

3.1 Combable groups

Call a function $\sigma : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ a reparameterization if

- $\sigma(0) = 0$,
- $\sigma(n+1)$ equals either $\sigma(n)$ or $\sigma(n) + 1$,
- $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(n) = \infty$

Definition 2 Let $(X, *)$ be a discrete metric space with basepoint. By a combing of X we will mean a collection of functions $\{f_n : X \rightarrow X\}_{n \geq 0}$ satisfying

- (C1) $f_0(x) = x \quad \forall x \in X$
- (C2) There exists a super-additive function ψ such that $\forall x, y \in X$, there are reparameterizations σ and σ' with $d(f_{\sigma(n)}(x), f_{\sigma'(n)}(y)) \leq \psi(d(x, y))$ for all $n \geq 0$.
- (C3) $\exists \lambda$ such that $\forall x \in X, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $d(f_n(x), f_{n+1}(x)) \leq \lambda$
- (C4) $\exists \phi$ such that $f_n(x) = * \quad \forall n \geq \phi(d(x, *))$

Remarks:

- As noted in the introduction, the combings above are oriented in the opposite direction than what has been customarily the case.
- Axiom (C2) allows for what are typically referred to as asynchronous combings, with synchronous combings corresponding to the case that the reparameterizations are the identity maps. Note also that
- the reparameterizations σ, σ' in (C2) depend on x and y .

Definition 3 Given a discrete group G equipped with a (proper) length function L , a combing of G (with respect to L), or (G, L) , is a combing of the discrete metric space (G, d_L) , where $d_L(g_1, g_2) := L(g_1^{-1}g_2)$.

We first show that reparameterizations can be chosen so as to be compatible on specific $(n+1)$ -tuples.

Lemma 2 Suppose (G, L) admits an asynchronous combing in the above sense. Then for all $(m+1)$ -tuples $(g_0, \dots, g_m) \in G^{(m+1)}$, there exist reparameterizations $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_m$ such that

$$\forall n \geq 0, d(f_{\sigma_i(n)}(g_i), f_{\sigma_{i+1}(n)}(g_{i+1})) \leq \psi(d(g_i, g_{i+1}))$$

Proof By definition it is true for $m = 1$. Assume then it is true for fixed $m \geq 1$. Given an $(m+2)$ -tuple $(g_0, \dots, g_{m+1})$, we may assume by induction that

- There exist reparameterizations $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_m$ with $d(f_{\sigma_i(n)}(g_i), f_{\sigma_{i+1}(n)}(g_{i+1})) \leq \psi(d(g_i, g_{i+1}))$ for all $n \geq 1$, and
- There exist reparameterizations σ'_m, σ'_{m+1} with $d(f_{\sigma'_m(n)}(g_m), f_{\sigma'_{m+1}(n)}(g_{m+1})) \leq \psi(d(g_m, g_{m+1}))$ for all $n \geq 1$

We need to show that the reparameterization functions can be further reparameterized so as to synchronize σ_m and σ'_m . For this we proceed by induction on $k \in \mathbb{N}$ = the domain of the reparameterization functions.

$k = 0$ By definition, $\sigma_m(0) = \sigma'_m(0) = 0$.

$k > 0$ Suppose $\sigma_m(i) = \sigma'_m(i)$ for $0 \leq i \leq k$.

Case 1 $\sigma_m(k+1) = \sigma'_m(k+1)$. In this case there is nothing to do.

Case 2 $\sigma_m(k+1) = \sigma_m(k), \sigma'_m(k+1) = \sigma'_m(k) + 1$. In this case we leave σ_m alone, and redefine σ'_m, σ'_{m+1} :

$$\text{for } l = m, m+1, (\sigma'_l)_{\text{new}}(i) = \begin{cases} (\sigma'_l)_{\text{old}}(i) & 0 \leq i \leq k \\ (\sigma'_l)_{\text{old}}(i) - 1 & k+1 \leq i \end{cases}$$

Case 3 $\sigma_m(k+1) = \sigma_m(k) + 1, \sigma'_m(k+1) = \sigma'_m(k)$. In this case we leave σ'_m alone, and redefine $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_m$:

$$\text{for } 0 \leq l \leq m, (\sigma_l)_{\text{new}}(i) = \begin{cases} (\sigma_l)_{\text{old}}(i) & 0 \leq i \leq k \\ (\sigma_l)_{\text{old}}(i) - 1 & k+1 \leq i \end{cases}$$

Thus by induction on k , we may choose reparameterization functions $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_m, \sigma'_m, \sigma'_{m+1}$ with

- (S1) $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_m$ satisfying the conditions of the Lemma for the $(m+1)$ -tuple $(g_0, \dots, g_m)$,
- (S2) σ'_m, σ'_{m+1} satisfying the conditions of the Lemma for the pair (g_m, g_{m+1}) ,
- (S3) $\sigma_m = \sigma'_m$

Setting $\sigma_{m+1} := \sigma'_{m+1}$ then concludes the proof of the initial induction step, and hence of the Lemma. $\square$

Definition 4 We say that a metric space (X, d) is quasi-geodesic if there exist positive constants ϵ , S , and C such that for any two points $x, y \in X$, there is a finite sequence of points $x_0 = x, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k = y$ satisfying:

- (1) $\epsilon \leq d(x_i, x_{i+1}) \leq S$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$.
- (2) $d(x_0, x_1) + d(x_1, x_2) + \dots + d(x_{k-1}, x_k) \leq Cd(x, y)$.

As we are concerned primarily with connected complexes, all metric spaces we consider will be assumed to be quasi-geodesic.

Lemma 3 Suppose $\{f_n : X \rightarrow X\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an asynchronous combing of a quasi-geodesic metric space (X, d) . There exists a positive constant K such that for all $x, y \in X$, there are reparameterizations σ and σ' such that for all $n \geq 0$, $d(f_{\sigma(n)}(x), f_{\sigma'(n)}(y)) \leq Kd(x, y)$.

Proof Let $x_0 = x, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k = y$ be given by the quasi-geodesic property. By lemma 2 there are reparameterizations, σ_i , such that $d(f_{\sigma_i(n)}(x_i), f_{\sigma_{i+1}(n)}(x_{i+1})) \leq \psi(S)$, for all n . As $k \leq \frac{C}{\epsilon}d(x, y)$, the triangle inequality yields $d(f_{\sigma_0(n)}(x), f_{\sigma_k(n)}(y)) \leq \frac{\psi(S)C}{\epsilon}d(x, y)$, for all n . $\square$

The next theorem was originally shown for synchronously combable groups in [A], and asynchronously combable groups through dimension 3 in [Ge]. Our method of proof actually proves more, as we will see in the following section.

Theorem 2 If (G, L) admits an asynchronous combing in the above sense, then it is type HF^∞ .

Proof Let EG denote the simplicial homogeneous bar resolution of G . Let G act in the usual way on the left, by $g \cdot (g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n) := (gg_0, gg_1, \dots, gg_n)$. Define a G -invariant simplicial weight function on EG by

$$w_n(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n) := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} d(g_i, g_{i+1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} L(g_i^{-1}g_{i+1})$$

Because L is proper, the orbit $\{(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n) \mid w_n(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n) \leq N\}/G$ is a finite set for each n and N . This orbit may alternatively be described as $\pi^{-1}(B_N(BG_n))$,

where BG is the non-homogeneous bar construction on G , $\pi : EG \rightarrow BG$ is given by $\pi(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n) = [g_0^{-1}g_1, g_1^{-1}g_2, \dots, g_{n-1}^{-1}g_n]$, and $B_N(-)$ denotes the N -ball $B_N(BG_n) := \{[g_1, \dots, g_n] \mid \sum_{i=1}^n L(g_i) \leq N\}$.

Recall that given two simplicial functions $h_0, h_1 : EG \rightarrow EG$, there is a homotopy between them represented by the “sum”

$$H(h_0, h_1)(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n) = \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i (h_0(g_0), h_0(g_1), \dots, h_0(g_i), h_1(g_i), h_1(g_{i+1}), \dots, h_1(g_n))$$

Although we have written this sum algebraically, this should be viewed as a geometric sum which associates to the n -simplex $(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n)$ the collection of $(n+1)$ -simplices indicated by the right-hand side, with orientation determined by the coefficient $(-1)^i$. Geometrically, this collection of $(n+1)$ simplices, all of dimension $(n+1)$, fit together to form a subset whose geometric realization is homeomorphic to $\Delta_n \times [0, 1]$. In fact, this last statement is true for more general types of maps which are not simplicial. In particular, given i) a fixed asynchronous combing $\{f_n\}$ of G , ii) a fixed n -simplex $(g_0, \dots, g_n)$ of EG , and iii) a collection of reparameterizations $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_n$ satisfying the condition of Lemma 1 with respect to i) and ii), we may consider the “homotopy” from $(f_{\sigma_0(m)}(g_0), f_{\sigma_1(m)}(g_1), \dots, f_{\sigma_n(m)}(g_n))$ to $(f_{\sigma_0(m+1)}(g_0), f_{\sigma_1(m+1)}(g_1), \dots, f_{\sigma_n(m+1)}(g_n))$ given by the expression

$$(20) \quad H^{\mathcal{Q}}(\{f_k\}; m, m+1)(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n) \\ := \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i (f_{\sigma_0(m)}(g_0), f_{\sigma_1(m)}(g_1), \dots, f_{\sigma_i(m)}(g_i), f_{\sigma_{i(m+1)}}(g_i), f_{\sigma_{i(m+1)}}(g_{i+1}), \dots, f_{\sigma_{i(m+1)}}(g_n))$$

This is not part of a global homotopy, but still yields a collection of oriented $(n+1)$ -simplices whose realization is homeomorphic to $\Delta_n \times [0, 1]$. Moreover, these homotopies may be strung together, as the “end” of $H^{\mathcal{Q}}(\{f_k\}; m, m+1)(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n)$ and the “beginning” of $H^{\mathcal{Q}}(\{f_k\}; m+1, m+2)(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n)$ match up.

Given a function $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, write w_n^f for the weight function

$$w_n^f(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n) := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(d(g_i, g_{i+1}))$$

By Lemma 1 and property (C3),

$$(21) \quad w_{n+1} (H^{\mathcal{Q}}(\{f_k\}; m, m+1)(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&< (n+1) \left(w_n(f_{\sigma_0(m)}(g_0), f_{\sigma_1(m)}(g_1), \dots, f_{\sigma_n(m)}(g_n)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + w_n(f_{\sigma_0(m+1)}(g_0), f_{\sigma_1(m+1)}(g_1), \dots, f_{\sigma_n(m+1)}(g_n)) + \lambda \right) \\
&\leq (2n+2) \left(w_n^\psi(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n) + \lambda \right) \\
&\leq (2n+2)\psi(w_n(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n)) + (2n+2)\lambda
\end{aligned}$$

Equation (21) implies that every simplex in $\pi^{-1}(B_N(BG_n))$ can be coned off in $\pi^{-1}(B_{N'}(BG_n))$ where $N' = (2n+2)(\psi(N) + \lambda)$. Of course, degeneracies preserve the inequality. In other words, if $(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n) = s_I(g'_0, \dots, g'_k)$ for some iterated degeneracy map s_I and k -simplex $(g'_0, \dots, g'_k)$, then the inequality in (21) may be improved to

$$w_{n+1}(H^\sigma(\{f_k\}; m, m+1)(s_I(g'_0, \dots, g'_k))) < (2k+2)\psi(w_k(g'_0, \dots, g'_k)) + (2k+2)\lambda$$

Let $X(n) := EG^{(n)}$, the simplicial n -skeleton of EG . For each integer N , let $X(n)_N := X(n) \cap \pi^{-1}(B_N(BG))$. Then $X(n)$ is an n -good complex for G in the sense of [Br1], and obviously $X(n) = \lim_N X(n)_N$. Moreover, equations (20) and (21) together imply

$$(22) \quad X(n)_N \hookrightarrow X(n)_{N'} \text{ is null-homotopic, } N' = (2n+2)(\psi(N) + \lambda)$$

By Theorem 2.2 of [Br1], we conclude that G is of type FP^n . Then, as G is of type FP^n for each n , it must be of type FP^∞ [Br2]. $\square$

In fact, the explicit estimates in (21) and (22) allow one to conclude a bit more. We will need some terminology.

Definition 5 A discrete group with word-length (G, L) is $\mathcal{B}$ -combable (i.e., $\mathcal{B}$ -asynchronously combable) if the functions ψ and ϕ in (C2) and (C4) are bounded above by functions in the bounding class $\mathcal{B}$.

As indicated above, given a bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module V , one has the subcochain complex $\mathcal{BC}^*(G; V) \subset C^*(G; V) = \text{Hom}_G(C_*(EG), V)$ consisting of those cochains which are bounded in the bornology induced by $\mathcal{B}$. The group G , or pair (G, L) is called $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological with respect to V (abbr. V - $\mathcal{B}$ IC)) if the inclusion $\mathcal{BC}^*(G; V) \subset C^*(G; V)$ induces an isomorphism of cohomology groups in all degrees.

$$\mathcal{BH}^*(G; V) := H^*(\mathcal{BC}^*(G; V)) \xrightarrow{\cong} H^*(G; V)$$

$\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomologicality with respect the trivial module $\mathbb{C}$ is referred to simply as $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological ($\mathcal{B}$ -IC). The pair (G, L) is strongly $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological (abbr. $\mathcal{B}$ -SIC) if it is V - $\mathcal{B}$ IC for all bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -modules V .

Corollary 2 *Let G be a finitely-presented group equipped with word-length function L , and $\mathcal{B}$ a multiplicative bounding class. If (G, L) is asynchronously $\mathcal{B}$ -combable, then G is $\mathcal{B}$ -IC.*

Proof By the previous theorem, the hypothesis that G is $\mathcal{B}$ -asynchronously combable implies by equations (21) and (22) that in using the combing to cone off a simplex of weight m , both the number of simplices appearing in the cone, as well as the weight of each, is bounded above by $f_i(m)$ where $f_i \in \mathcal{B}$. By the multiplicativity of the bounding class $\mathcal{B}$, the bornological chain complex $\mathcal{B}C_*(EG)$ is a tempered complex in the sense of Meyer [M1] which satisfies the necessary conditions established by Meyer to conclude the result (Meyer's original result was stated only for the polynomial, subexponential and simple exponential bounding classes, but the same argument works for arbitrary multiplicative bounding classes). $\square$

3.2 $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomologicality and type BHF^∞ groups

It is natural to ask the relation between the purely homological notion of strong $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomologicality and the more geometric/topological BHF^∞ condition. The following result answers that question; it is a generalization to arbitrary bounding classes of [JR1, Thm. 2.6].

Theorem 3 *Let G be a discrete group of type FP^∞ and $\mathcal{B}$ a bounding class. The following are equivalent.*

- (B1) (G, L) is strongly $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological
- (B2) $BH^*(G; V) \rightarrow H^*(G; V)$ is surjective for all bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -modules V
- (B3) G is type BFP^∞

Proof Following Th. 2.6 of [JR1]. (B1) obviously implies (B2). The main point is to show (B2) implies (B3), specifically that there exists a resolution C_* of $\mathbb{C}$ over $\mathbb{C}[G]$ whose completion $\mathcal{B}C_*$ with respect to the semi-norms induced by $\mathcal{B}$ yields a continuous resolution of $\mathbb{C}$ over $H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$. The proof will use specific coefficient

modules. Given a subcomplex b of a free polyhedral complex Z equipped with a 1-skeleton weight function w_Z , the weight of b is then $|b|_w := \sum_{\sigma \in b} w_Z(\sigma)$. Each $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}$ defines a seminorm on $C_m(Z)$ by

$$\left| \sum_{\sigma \in Z_m} \alpha_\sigma \sigma \right|_\lambda := \sum_{\sigma \in Z_m} |\alpha_\sigma| \lambda(w_Z(\sigma))$$

Letting $C_m(Z)_\lambda$ denote the completion of $C_m(Z)$ in this seminorm, we set

$$\mathcal{BC}_m(Z) := \bigcap_{\lambda \in \mathcal{B}} C_m(Z)_\lambda$$

As was shown in [JOR1], there is a natural identification of bornological spaces

$$\mathcal{BC}_m(Z)^* \cong \mathcal{BC}^m(Z) := \{c \in C^m(Z) \mid \exists \lambda \in \mathcal{B} \text{ s.t. } \forall \sigma \in Z_m, |c([\sigma])| < \lambda(w_Z(\sigma))\}$$

where the left-hand term denotes the bounded dual of $\mathcal{BC}_m(Z)$, and the right-hand term is the sub-space of $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded m -cocycles on Z .

Now consider $B_m(Z) = \partial_{m+1}(C_{m+1}(Z)) \subset C_m(Z)$. There are two ways to complete this subspace. The first is to take its closure in $\mathcal{BC}_m(Z)$. Alternatively, one could consider the (possibly) smaller space $\tilde{B}_m(Z) = \partial_{m+1}(\mathcal{BC}_{m+1}(Z))$. On the space of algebraic boundaries $B_m(Z)$ one has the filling seminorms $\|\cdot\|_{f,\lambda}$, $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}$, weakly defined by

$$\|b\|_{f,\lambda} \leq M \Leftrightarrow \exists a \in C_{m+1}(Z) \text{ s.t. } b = \partial(a) \text{ \& } \lambda(w_Z(a)) = M$$

and $\tilde{B}_m(Z)$ is the completion of $B_m(Z)$ in these seminorms. The existence of a $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded section $\tilde{s}_{m+1} : C_m \rightarrow C_{m+1}$ is equivalent to the requirement that, on $\tilde{B}_m(Z)$, the bornology defined by the filling seminorms $\|\cdot\|_{f,\lambda}$, $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}$ is the same as the induced bornology coming from the inclusion into $\mathcal{BC}_m(Z)$. Note that $\tilde{B}_m(Z)$ is naturally a module over $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$. Given a bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module V with bornology defined by a collection of seminorms $\{\eta_i\}_{i \in I}$, an m -cochain $c \in C^m(Z; V)$ is $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded (i.e., lies in the subspace $\mathcal{BC}^m(Z; V)$) if

$$\forall \lambda \in \mathcal{B} \exists \lambda' \in \mathcal{B} \text{ s.t. } \forall \sigma \in Z_m, \|c(\sigma)\|_{f,\lambda} \leq \lambda'(w_Z(\sigma)) = \|\sigma\|_{\lambda'}$$

Then, as was shown in [JOR1], $\mathcal{BH}_G^*(Z; V) := \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^*(\mathbb{C}, V) =$ the cohomology of the cochain complex $\{\mathcal{BC}^m(Z; V)\}_{m \geq 0}$.

We recall the terminology of Th. 2.6 of [JR1], and then show how the result proved in that theorem may be extended to the $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded setting.

- X is a free G -complex with finitely many distinct G -orbits in each dimension (i.e., X/G has finitely many cells in each dimension; it exists by the HF^∞ condition on G).
- Y is the geometric realization of the homogeneous bar resolution on G .
- $\phi_* : C_*(Y) \rightarrow C_*(X)$ and $\psi_* : C_*(X) \rightarrow C_*(Y)$ are $\mathbb{C}[G]$ -module morphisms of chain complexes, with both $\phi_* \circ \psi_*$ and $\psi_* \circ \phi_*$ G -equivariantly chain-homotopic to the identity function.
- The coefficient module used to show the existence of an appropriately bounded $(m-1)^{\text{st}}$ Dehn function is $V_{m-1} = \tilde{B}_{m-1}(X)$, equipped with the filling seminorms $\| \cdot \|_{f,\lambda}$, $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}$.
- $u \in C_G^m(X; V_{m-1})$ is the G -equivariant m -cocycle given as the composition $C_m(X) \xrightarrow{\partial_m} B_{m-1}(X) \hookrightarrow V_{m-1}$.

The properties of ϕ and ψ ensure there is a G -equivariant $(m-1)$ -cocycle $v \in C_G^{m-1}(X; V_{m-1})$ with $u = (\psi^m \circ \phi^m)(u) + \delta(v)$. Furthermore, condition (B2) guarantees there is a G -equivariant $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cocycle $u' \in \mathcal{B}C_G^m(Y; V_{m-1})$ and a G -equivariant $(m-1)$ -cochain $v' \in C_G^{m-1}(Y; V_{m-1})$ satisfying the equation $\psi^m(u) = u' + \delta(v')$. A standard argument then shows

$$(23) \quad b = u'([e, \psi_{m-1}(b)]) + (\psi^{m-1}(v') + v)(b)$$

where $[e, \sum \gamma_{[g_0, \dots, g_n]}[g_0, \dots, g_n]] := \sum \gamma_{[g_0, \dots, g_n]}[e, g_0, \dots, g_n]$. Finally, both X and Y are weighted complexes. For X , starting with the graph metric d_X , the associated weight function is precisely the 1-skeleton weight function w_X defined above. In the case of Y , the metric on the 0-skeleton is given by the formula $d(g_1, g_2) := L(g_1^{-1}g_2)$, which yields the standard G -sensitive weight function on $Y = EG$ given by

$$w_Y([g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n]) := \sum_{i=0}^n w_Y([g_i]) = \sum_{i=0}^n L(g_i) = d_Y(g_i, e)$$

Note that for $Z = X$ or Y , the respective weight functions satisfies the inequality

$$w_Z(g\sigma) \leq (n+1)w_Z(g) + w_Z(\sigma) \quad \forall \sigma \in Z^{(n)}$$

up to linear equivalence.

The following lemma illustrates the essential point of the finiteness condition on X . Assume given free G -sets S, T equipped with weight functions w_S resp. w_T , such that S/G is a finite set. Let $\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N\} \subset S$ be a complete set of coset representatives satisfying $w_S(s_j) \leq w_S(gs_j)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq N$, $g \in G$. Finally, we assume the existence of constants D_1, D_2, D_3 satisfying

- (1) $w(gz) \leq D_1 L(g) + w(z) \quad \forall z \in Z = S, T, \quad w = w_S, w_T$
- (2) $L(g) \leq D_2 w_S(g s_j) + D_3 \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq N, g \in G$

Recall that for a weighted set (Z, w) , bounding class $\mathcal{B}$ and $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}$, $\|\cdot\|_\lambda$ is the weighted ℓ^1 -norm on $\mathbb{C}[Z] = \oplus_{z \in Z} \mathbb{C}$ given by

$$\left\| \sum \alpha_z z \right\|_\lambda := \sum |\alpha_z| \lambda(w(z))$$

Lemma 4 *Let S, T be as above, and V , respectively W , denote the vector space over $\mathbb{C}$ with basis S , respectively T . Let $W_{\mathcal{B}}$ denote the completion of W in the seminorms $\{\|\cdot\|_\lambda, \lambda \in \mathcal{B}\}$, and let $f : V \rightarrow W$ be an arbitrary G -equivariant linear map. Then f is $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded; that is, for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}$ there exists $\lambda_1 \in \mathcal{B}$ with*

$$\|f(v)\|_\lambda \leq \|v\|_{\lambda_1} \quad \forall v \in V$$

Proof For each s_j ($1 \leq j \leq N$), we have

$$f(s_j) = \sum_{i=1}^{M_j} \beta_{ij} t_{ij}$$

Define

$$M_1 = \max_{1 \leq j \leq N} \left(\sum_i |\beta_{ij}| \right)$$

$$M_2 = \max_{1 \leq j \leq N} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq m_j} w_T(t_{ij}) \right)$$

We can bound the λ -seminorm of $f(g s_j)$ using the sequence of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(g s_j)\|_\lambda &= \|g f(s_j)\|_\lambda \\ &= \left\| g \left(\sum_i \beta_{ij} t_{ij} \right) \right\|_\lambda \\ &\leq \sum_i |\beta_{ij}| \lambda(w_T(g t_{ij})) \\ &\leq \sum_i |\beta_{ij}| \lambda(D_1 L(g) + w_T(t_{ij})) \\ &\leq \sum_i |\beta_{ij}| \lambda(D_1 L(g) + M_2) \\ &\leq M_1 \lambda(D_1 L(g) + M_2) \\ &\leq M_1 \lambda(D_1(D_2 w_S(g s_j) + D_3) + M_2) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq M_1 \lambda (D_1 D_2 w_S(g s_j) + (D_1 D_3 + M_2)) \\ &\leq \lambda_1(w_S(g s_j)) \end{aligned}$$

for $\lambda_1 \in \mathcal{B}$ satisfying the inequality $M_1 \lambda (D_1 D_2 t + D_1 D_3 + M_2) \leq \lambda_1(t)$ (such an element exists by property $(\mathcal{BC}3)$). Now a typical element of V may be written as $\sum \alpha_s s = \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{g \in G} \alpha_{j,g} g s_j$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \mathfrak{f} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{g \in G} \alpha_{j,g} g s_j \right) \right\|_{\lambda} \\ &= \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{g \in G} \alpha_{j,g} \mathfrak{f}(g s_j) \right\|_{\lambda} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{g \in G} |\alpha_{j,g}| \|\mathfrak{f}(g s_j)\|_{\lambda} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{g \in G} |\alpha_{j,g}| \lambda_1(w_S(g s_j)) \\ &= \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{g \in G} \alpha_{j,g} g s_j \right\|_{\lambda_1} \end{aligned}$$

□

Let $W' \subset W_{\mathcal{B}}$ be a subspace closed in the Frechet bornology (= topology), and set $W'' = W_{\mathcal{B}}/W'$. The quotient bornology on this space is induced by the seminorms $\|\cdot\|_{f, \lambda \in \mathcal{B}}$ weakly defined by

$$\|w\|_{f, \lambda} \leq M' \Leftrightarrow \exists v \in W_{\mathcal{B}} \text{ s.t. } \pi(v) = w' \text{ and } \|v\|_{\lambda} \leq M'$$

where $\pi : W_{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow W'$ is the projection map (these norms should be thought of as a “filling” norms). Suppose we are also given a G -equivariant linear map $\mathfrak{h} : V \rightarrow W'$. Then $\mathfrak{h}$ can be lifted to a G -equivariant linear map $\mathfrak{f} : V \rightarrow W_{\mathcal{B}}$, which will then obviously satisfy the inequality

$$\|\mathfrak{h}(v)\|_{f, \lambda} \leq \|\mathfrak{f}(v)\|_{\lambda}$$

By the previous lemma, this lifting is $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded. Hence

Lemma 5 *Any G -equivariant linear map $\mathfrak{h} : V \rightarrow W'$ is $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded; i.e., for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}$ there exists a $\lambda' \in \mathcal{B}$ with*

$$\|\mathfrak{h}(v)\|_{f, \lambda} \leq \|v\|_{\lambda'} \quad \forall v \in V$$

We may now complete the proof that $(\mathcal{B}2)$ implies $(\mathcal{B}3)$. By (23), one has

$$\|b\|_{f,\lambda} \leq \|u'([e, \psi_{m-1}(b)])\|_{f,\lambda} + \|(\psi^{m-1}(v') + v)(b)\|_{f,\lambda}$$

As u' is $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded, there exists an element $\lambda' \in \mathcal{B}$ satisfying

$$\|u'([e, \psi_{m-1}(b)])\|_{f,\lambda} \leq \|[e, \psi_{m-1}(b)]\|_{\lambda'} = \|\psi_{m-1}(b)\|_{\lambda'}$$

Taking $(S, w_S) = (X^{(m-1)}, w_X)$ and $(T, w_T) = (Y^{(m-1)}, w_Y)$ and applying Lemma 4 shows that ψ_{m-1} is $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded. By Lemma 5, the map $(\psi^{(m-1)}(v') + v) : C_{m-1}(X) \rightarrow V_{m-1}$ is also bounded. Hence the sum must be bounded; i.e., for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}$, there exists a $\lambda'' \in \mathcal{B}$ with

$$\|b\|_{f,\lambda} \leq \|b\|_{\lambda''}$$

The implication $(\mathcal{B}3) \Rightarrow (\mathcal{B}1)$ follows by a natural extension of the arguments of [JR1] and [O1]. Namely, given the free G -complex X , one forms the complex $C_*^{\mathcal{B}}(X)$, where $C_n^{\mathcal{B}}(X)$ denotes the completion of $C_n(X)$ in the seminorms

$$\left\| \sum_{\sigma \in X^{(n)}} \alpha_{\sigma} \sigma \right\|_{\lambda} := \sum_{\sigma \in X^{(n)}} |\alpha_{\sigma}| \lambda(w_X(\sigma)) \quad \lambda \in \mathcal{B}$$

The condition that all of the Dehn functions are $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded is exactly what is needed to provide a bounded $\mathbb{C}$ -linear contraction of $C_*^{\mathcal{B}}(X)$, hence a resolution of $\mathbb{C}$ over $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$. Degree-wise, this complex is a free $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module on finitely many generators (one for each G -orbit of $X^{(n)}$), which together imply the result. $\square$

In fact the argument above shows slightly more.

Theorem 4 *Let G be a finitely generated group of type HF^r , for some $r \leq \infty$. For an $n < r$, the following are equivalent.*

- (B'1) $BH^*(G; V) \rightarrow H^*(G; V)$ is an isomorphism for all bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -modules V , in all degrees $* \leq n + 1$.
- (B'2) $BH^*(G; V) \rightarrow H^*(G; V)$ is surjective for all bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -modules V , in all degrees $* \leq n + 1$.
- (B'3) There exists a geometric resolution X_* of G of finite type (all skeleta of X_*/G are finite) for which the first n (weighted) Dehn functions of $C_*(X)$ are $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded.

Proof The implication $(B'1) \Rightarrow (B'2)$ is obvious. For $(B'2) \Rightarrow (B'3)$, follow the proof of $(\mathcal{B}2) \Rightarrow (\mathcal{B}3)$ in Theorem 3. As the argument is degree-by-degree, it carries over without change.

To prove the implication $(\mathcal{B}'3) \Rightarrow (\mathcal{B}'1)$, construct $C_*(X)$ and $C_*^{\mathcal{B}}(X)$ as in $(\mathcal{B}3) \Rightarrow (\mathcal{B}1)$. The chain complex $C_*(X)$ is a resolution of $\mathbb{C}$ over $\mathbb{C}[G]$, but $C_*^{\mathcal{B}}(X)$ does not admit a bounded $\mathbb{C}$ -linear contracting homotopy for all degrees. It does, however, for $* \leq n$. Let $\mathcal{S}_* = C_*^{\mathcal{B}}(X)$, for $* \leq n+1$. Using the fact that the category of bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -modules has enough projectives, for $* > n+1$ $\mathcal{S}_*$ can be chosen so that $\mathcal{S}_*$ is a bornologically projective resolution of $\mathbb{C}$ over $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$. Continuing as in Theorem 3 yields the result. $\square$

4 Relative constructions

We show how the results in the previous section may be “relativized”.

4.1 Relative HF^n and the Brown-Bieri-Eckmann condition

In this subsection, n will denote an arbitrary cardinal $\leq \infty$. Given a family of subgroups $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ of G , let

$$\Delta = \Delta(\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}) := \ker \left(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{Z}[G/H_\alpha] \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathbb{Z} \right)$$

where ε is the linear extension of the map $gH_\alpha \mapsto 1$. Then Δ is a $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ -module; given a second $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ -module A , the homology of G relative to the family of subgroups $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ with coefficients in A is [BE2]

$$H_*(G, \{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}; A) := \mathrm{Tor}_{*-1}^{\mathbb{Z}[G]}(\Delta, A)$$

Algebraically, this makes perfect sense regardless of how the groups intersect. Our object is to establish necessary and sufficient conditions for relative finiteness. A natural starting point is

Lemma 6 *Suppose that*

- (1) *the indexing set Λ is finite,*
- (2) *each subgroup H_α is finitely generated,*
- (3) *G is finitely presented,*
- (4) *$\mathrm{Tor}_*^{\mathbb{Z}[G]}(\Delta, \prod \mathbb{Z}[G]) = 0$ for all $1 \leq * \leq (n-1)$ and direct products $\prod \mathbb{Z}[G]$ of copies of $\mathbb{Z}[G]$.*

Then Δ is type FP^n over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$.

Proof Consider the commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} 0 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{Z}[G] & \xrightarrow{=} & \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{Z}[G] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow p_1 & & \downarrow p_2 \\ \Delta & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{Z}[G/H_\alpha] & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} & \mathbb{Z} \end{array}$$

where on each summand p_1 is the natural projection $\mathbb{Z}[G] \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{Z}[G/H_\alpha]$ and $p_2 = \varepsilon \circ p_1$. Denote $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{Z}[G/H_\alpha]$ by E , $\mathbb{Z}$ by B , and set $P(E) := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{Z}[G]$, $\Omega(E) := \ker(p_1)$, $\Omega(B) := \ker(p_2)$. By the Snake Lemma, the above diagram yields a short-exact sequence $\Omega(E) \hookrightarrow \Omega(B) \twoheadrightarrow \Delta$. Now consider the pull-back diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega(E) & \xlongequal{\quad} & \Omega(E) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ P(E, \Delta) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & P(E) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Delta & \xrightarrow{\quad} & E \end{array}$$

There is a natural isomorphism of $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ -modules $P(E, \Delta) \cong \Omega(B)$, from which we conclude the existence of a short-exact sequence

$$(24) \quad \Omega(B) \cong P(E, \Delta) \hookrightarrow \Delta \oplus P(E) \twoheadrightarrow E$$

Conditions 1. and 2. imply E is finitely-presented over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$, and condition 3. implies $\Omega(B)$ is finitely-presented over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$. By (24), $\Delta \oplus P(E)$ is finitely-presented over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$. But $P(E)$ is a finitely-generated free module over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ (by 1.), so Δ itself must be finitely-presented over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$. The result now follows from Prop. 1.2 of [BE1]. $\square$

Definition 6 *The group G is type FP^{n+1} (resp. FF^{n+1}) rel. $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ if the $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ -module Δ is type FP^n (resp. FF^n) over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$.*

As usual, if we are not concerned with constructing finite resolutions but only ones which are finite-dimensional through the given range, the conditions FF^n and FP^n agree.

We consider an alternative definition, which will provide the bridge between the algebraic and topological setting.

Definition 7 *A resolution of $\mathbb{Z}$ over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ relative to a family of subgroups $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ is a projective resolution P_* of $\mathbb{Z}$ over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ satisfying*

$$P_m = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \text{Ind}_{H_\alpha}^G(W_m^\alpha) \oplus Q_m$$

where for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$, W_*^α is a projective resolution of $\mathbb{Z}$ over $\mathbb{Z}[H_\alpha]$ and $\text{Ind}_{H_\alpha}^G(W_*^\alpha) \hookrightarrow P_*$ is an inclusion of complexes. Then G is type $\widetilde{FP}^n$, respectively type $\widetilde{FF}^n$, if Q_m is finitely generated projective, respectively free over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$, for all finite $m \leq n$.

Again, when the resolutions are allowed to be infinite, $\widetilde{FP}^n$ and $\widetilde{FF}^n$ are equivalent conditions.

Lemma 7 *If G is type FP^n relative to $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$, it is type $\widetilde{FP}^n$ relative to $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$. If conditions 1. - 3. in Lemma 6 are satisfied, then the converse is true.*

Proof Let R_* be a resolution of Δ over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$, and let S_* be the $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ -resolution $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \text{Ind}_{H_\alpha}^G(W_*^\alpha)$ of $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{Z}[G/H_\alpha]$ where W_*^α is a $\mathbb{Z}[H_\alpha]$ -resolution of $\mathbb{Z}$ for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$. Let $f_* : R_* \rightarrow S_*$ be a map of $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ -resolutions covering the inclusion $\Delta \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{Z}[G/H_\alpha]$, and let $M(f_*)$ be the algebraic mapping cone of f_* . Then $M(f_*)$ provides a resolution of $\mathbb{Z}$ over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ rel. $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ where $Q_m = R_{m-1}$. Hence type FP^n rel. $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ implies type $\widetilde{FP}^n$ rel. $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$. Now suppose G is type $\widetilde{FP}^n$ rel. $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$. As we have seen, the first three conditions of Lemma 6 imply Δ is finitely-presented. Let T_* be a $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ -resolution of G rel. $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$. Then S_* is a subcomplex of T_* , with the inclusion $S_* \hookrightarrow T_*$ covering the projection $\varepsilon : \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{Z}[G/H_\alpha] \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. The quotient complex $T_*/S_* = Q_* = \{Q_m\}$ satisfies the property

$$\text{Tor}_*^{\mathbb{Z}[G]}(\Delta, A) = H_{*+1}^G(Q_* \otimes A) = H_{*+1}(Q_* \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}[G]} A)$$

If $A = \prod \mathbb{Z}[G]$ and Q_m is finitely-generated projective for finite $m \leq n$, then

$$\text{Tor}_k^{\mathbb{Z}[G]}(\Delta, \prod \mathbb{Z}[G]) = H_{k+1}^G(Q_* \otimes \prod \mathbb{Z}[G]) = H_{k+1}\left(\left\{\prod Q_m\right\}_{m \geq 0}\right) = 0$$

for all finite $k \leq (n-1)$. By Lemma 6 this completes the proof. $\square$

We now consider the topological analogue. Let $\{A_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ be a family of subcomplexes of a complex X , and let $A = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} A_\alpha \subseteq X$. We say that X is type HF^n relative to $\{A_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ if $X/A \simeq Y$ with Y having finitely many cells (or simplices) in each finite dimension $m \leq n$.

If $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ is a family of subgroups of G , then whenever Λ contains more than one element $\prod BH_\alpha$ will not be a subspace of the standard model for BG , as the classifying spaces BH_α all contain the common basepoint (and more if the intersections

are non-trivial). However, the $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ -module Δ is modeled on the disjoint union of the classifying spaces $\{BH_\alpha\}$. To accommodate this, we will need a different model for BG . Recall that if T is a discrete set, one may form the free simplicial set $S_\bullet(T)$ generated by T , with

$$(25) \quad S_m(T) := T^{m+1};$$

$$(26) \quad \partial_i(t_0, t_1, \dots, t_n) = (t_0, t_1, \dots, \widehat{t_i}, \dots, t_n);$$

$$(27) \quad s_j(t_0, t_1, \dots, t_n) = (t_0, t_1, \dots, t_j, t_j, \dots, t_n)$$

In other words, the face and degeneracy maps are given by deletion and repetition. Any element of T can be used to define a simplicial contraction of $S_\bullet(T)$, yielding $S_\bullet(T) \simeq *$ for all sets T . Moreover, if T is a free G -set, then the diagonal action of G makes $S_\bullet(T)$ a simplicial free G -set, hence a simplicial model for a universal contractible G -space. The standard homogeneous bar resolution of G - EG - arises when one takes $T = G$ with left G -action given by multiplication.

Definition 8 For an indexing set Λ , let

$$G(\Lambda) := \coprod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} G$$

with G -action given by left multiplication on each component. Then

$$EG(\Lambda) := S_\bullet(G(\Lambda))$$

$$BG(\Lambda) := EG(\Lambda)/G$$

Again, if $\{T_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ is a collection of G -sets, there is an evident inclusion of simplicial G -sets

$$(28) \quad \coprod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} S_\bullet(T_\alpha) \xrightarrow{i_\Lambda} S_\bullet\left(\coprod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} T_\alpha\right)$$

which is both equivariant and functorial.

Definition 9 A group G is of type HF^n relative to a family of subgroups $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ ($n \leq \infty$) if $BG(\Lambda)$ is of type HF^n relative to the image of $\coprod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} BH_\alpha$ under the composition

$$\coprod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} BH_\alpha \hookrightarrow \coprod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} BG \xrightarrow{i_\Lambda} BG(\Lambda)$$

Proposition 2 *Assume the indexing set Λ is finite. If G is type HF^n relative to $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$, then it is type $\widetilde{FF}^n$ relative to $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$.*

Proof For each α , fix a simplicial complex $X_{H_\alpha} \simeq BH_\alpha$. The condition on G implies we may construct a simplicial model $X_G \simeq BG$ by adding simplices (i.e., cells) to $\coprod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} X_{H_\alpha}$ in such a way that through each finite dimension m with $0 \leq m \leq n$ the number of simplices attached is finite. Let $\widetilde{X}_G \simeq EG$ be the universal cover of X_G , and $p : \widetilde{X}_G \rightarrow X_G$ the covering map. Taking $P_* = C_*(\widetilde{X}_G)$ gives the desired resolution, with $\text{Ind}_{H_\alpha}^G(W_*) = C_*(p^{-1}(X_{H_\alpha}))$ and Q_n the free $\mathbb{C}[G]$ -submodule of P_n spanned over $\mathbb{C}$ by those n -cells not in $p^{-1}\left(\coprod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} X_{H_\alpha}\right)$. $\square$

Putting it all together, we may summarize the situation as

Theorem 5 *If the conditions 1. - 4. of Lemma 6 are satisfied, then the following are equivalent*

- G is type HF^n relative to $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$,
- G is type $\widetilde{FF}^n$ relative to $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$,
- G is type FF^n relative to $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$.

Proof The second and third properties are equivalent by Lemma 7, and the first property implies the second by the previous proposition. The converse to Proposition 2, in the presence of conditions 1. through 4., follows by the same method of geometrically realizing the resolution as in the classical proof of the Eilenberg-Ganea-Wall theorem (compare Thm. 7.1, Chap. VIII of [Br1]). $\square$

Recall from [Br2] that a direct system of groups $\{A_\beta\}$ is said to be essentially trivial if for each β_1 there is a $\beta_2 \geq \beta_1$ such that the map $A_{\beta_1} \rightarrow A_{\beta_2}$ is trivial.

Definition 10 *A filtration of $EG(\Lambda)$ of finite n -type relative to $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ is an increasing filtration of $EG(\Lambda)$ by a direct system of subcomplexes $\{X_\beta\}$ satisfying*

- $\varinjlim_{\beta} X_\beta = EG(\Lambda)$,
- $X_\emptyset := p^{-1}\left(\coprod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} BH_\alpha\right) \subseteq X_\beta$ for all β ,
- For each β , $X_\beta/X_\emptyset$ contains finitely many G -orbits in finite dimensions $\leq n$.

Theorem 6 Suppose there exists a filtration $\{X_\beta\}$ of finite n -type of EG relative to $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$. Assume conditions 1. - 4. of Lemma 6. If the directed system $\{H_*(X_\beta)\}$ is essentially trivial for all finite $* \leq n$, then Δ is type FP^{n-1} over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$.

Proof Let $R = \mathbb{Z}[G]$. Then for all finite m with $1 \leq m \leq (n-1)$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tor}_m^R(\Delta, \prod R) &\cong \mathrm{Tor}_m^R(R, \Delta \otimes \prod R) \\ &= H_m^G(EG(\Lambda); \Delta \otimes \prod R) \\ &\cong H_{m+1}^G(EG, X_\emptyset; \prod R) \\ &\cong \varinjlim_\beta H_{m+1}^G(X_\beta/X_\emptyset; \prod R) \\ &\cong \varinjlim_\beta \prod H_{m+1}^G(X_\beta/X_\emptyset; R) \\ &= \varinjlim_\beta \prod H_{m+1}(X_\beta/X_\emptyset) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

with the last equality following by Lemma 2.1 of [Br2]. $\square$

Note that unlike Brown's condition in the absolute case (where we are not working relative to a family of subgroups), the quotient space $EG(\Lambda)/X_\emptyset$ has the homotopy-type of a wedge $\bigvee S^1$, with $H_1(\bigvee S^1) = \Delta$. This non-contractibility in dimension 1 makes verifying the essential triviality of relative filtrations problematic.

4.2 Relative Dehn functions

There is a natural algebraic way to define the relative Dehn functions of G with respect to some finite family of subgroups. As before, we write Δ for the kernel of the augmentation map $\epsilon : \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{Z}[G/H_\alpha] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, where $\mathcal{H} = \{H_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Lambda\}$. A typical element of $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{Z}[G/H_\alpha]$ has the form $\sum_{g \in \bigcup G/H_\alpha} \lambda_g g[H_{\alpha_g}]$. Thus to define the weighted structure on $\Delta \subset \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{Z}[G/H_\alpha]$, it is enough to define the weight of a generator, $g[H_\alpha]$. Set $w(g[H_\alpha]) = \min_{h \in H_\alpha} L(gh)$, where L is the length function equipped on G .

If G is of type FF^∞ relative to $\mathcal{H}$, there is a free resolution of Δ over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$:

$$\dots \rightarrow R_2 \rightarrow R_1 \rightarrow R_0 \rightarrow R_{-1} := \Delta \rightarrow 0$$

which is finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ -module in each dimension on generating set $S_n = \{s_{1,n}, \dots, s_{k_n,n}\}$. Fixing the weight of each generator to be 1, we extend this to a weight function on R_n in the usual way by

$$w\left(\sum \lambda_i g_i s_{j_i,n}\right) := \sum |\lambda_i| (L(g_i) + w(s_{j_i,n})) = \sum |\lambda_i| (L(g_i) + 1)$$

Up to linear equivalence, this definition is independent of the initial weighting given to the generating set. Now choose a $\mathbb{Z}$ -linear splitting of this resolution $\{s_n : R_n \rightarrow R_{n+1}\}_{n \geq -1}$; associated to this contraction are its Dehn functions, which we refer to as the relative Dehn functions of G with respect to $\mathcal{H}$. Again, up to linear equivalence, the definition of the Dehn functions is independent of the choice of linear splitting.

Definition 11 *The relative Dehn functions of G with respect to $\mathcal{H}$ are $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded if there is type FF^∞ resolution of Δ over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ such that each splitting s_n is bounded by an element of $\mathcal{B}$.*

Lemma 8 *Suppose $\mathcal{L} \preceq \mathcal{B}$. If the relative Dehn functions of G with respect to $\mathcal{H}$ are $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded for a particular type FF^∞ resolution, then they are $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded for all type FF^∞ resolutions.*

This is a relative version of the statement that the Dehn functions of a group G does not depend on which type HF^∞ classifying space is used in their construction, up to equivalence.

Since G is of relative type FF^∞ , it is also of relative type $\widetilde{FF}^\infty$, with respect to $\mathcal{H}$. As above, this gives a projective resolution of $\mathbb{Z}$ over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ of the form

$$P_m = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \text{Ind}_{H_\alpha}^G(W_m^\alpha) \oplus Q_m$$

where for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$, W_m^α is a projective resolution of $\mathbb{Z}$ over $\mathbb{Z}[H_\alpha]$, and Q_m is a finitely generated free $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ -module. At each level, $\text{Ind}_{H_\alpha}^G(W_m^\alpha)$ is a direct summand of P_m . Taking the quotient by them in each degree yields the sequence

$$\dots \rightarrow Q_3 \rightarrow Q_2 \rightarrow Q_1 \twoheadrightarrow Q_0 = 0$$

which is exact above dimension 1, and for which the cokernel of $Q_2 \rightarrow Q_1$ is Δ . Thus

$$\dots \rightarrow Q_3 \rightarrow Q_2 \rightarrow Q_1 \rightarrow \Delta \rightarrow 0$$

is a type FF^∞ resolution of Δ over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$.

Because the homology of both P_* and Q_* vanish above dimension 1, one can in that range construct a chain contraction $\{s_n^P : P_n \rightarrow P_{n+1}\}$ for which the composition

$$s_n^Q := Q_n \hookrightarrow P_n \xrightarrow{s_n^P} P_{n+1} \twoheadrightarrow Q_{n+1}$$

yields a chain contraction of Q_* for $* > 1$. This splitting, spliced together with a weight-minimizing section $s_0^Q : \Delta \rightarrow Q_1$ of the projection $Q_1 \twoheadrightarrow \Delta$, one can define the topological relative Dehn functions of G relative to $\mathcal{H}$ to be the Dehn functions associated to the linear contraction $\{s_n^Q\}_{n \geq 0}$. We say the topological Dehn functions are $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded if the Dehn functions of $\{s_n^Q\}_{n \geq 0}$ are $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded.

Lemma 9 *Suppose G is of type FF^∞ relative to $\mathcal{H}$. G has $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded algebraic relative Dehn functions with respect to $\mathcal{H}$ if and only if $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded topological relative Dehn functions with respect to $\mathcal{H}$*

This follows immediately from Lemma 8.

The term “topological relative Dehn function” is justified by the following interpretation of them. Assume G is HF^∞ relative to $\mathcal{H}$, as before. Start with a relative homology cycle in $x \in Z_n(EG(\Delta), E(\mathcal{H}))$. Then $\partial(x) \in C_{n-1}(E(\mathcal{H}))$. Each part of $\partial(x)$ lying in a connected component of $E(\mathcal{H})$ can be coned off, yielding an absolute cycle $x' \in Z_n(EG(\Delta))$. Choose a weight-minimizing $y \in C_{n+1}(EG(\Delta))$ with $\partial(y) = x'$, and take its weight relative to the subspace $E(\mathcal{H})$; i.e., only total the weights of those $(n+1)$ -simplices used to construct z which do not lie in $E(\mathcal{H})$. The resulting Dehn function computed using this construction agrees (up to the usual equivalence of Dehn functions) with the one derived from $\{s_n^Q\}_{n \geq 0}$.

One can view the nonexistence of a relative Dehn function in a particular degree as an obstruction to completing the type FF^∞ resolution of Δ ,

$$\dots \rightarrow Q_3 \rightarrow Q_2 \rightarrow Q_1 \rightarrow \Delta \rightarrow 0$$

to yield a type FF^∞ bornological resolution of $\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}$ (defined below).

$$\dots \rightarrow \mathcal{B}Q_3 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}Q_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}Q_1 \rightarrow \Delta_{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow 0$$

Although there is always a bounded section $\Delta \rightarrow Q_1$, the obstruction to constructing a bounded section $Q_1 \rightarrow Q_2$ is, in general, nontrivial in the unweighted setting. The relative Dehn functions for $n > 1$ do not suffer the same issue.

4.3 Relative $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology

We construct a relative $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology theory, which closely mirrors the construction of relative group cohomology in [Au, BE2]. Let G be a discrete group and let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Lambda\}$ be a finite collection of subgroups of G . Let $G/\mathcal{H}$ be the disjoint union $\bigsqcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} G/H_\alpha$. For a subgroup H of G let $\mathbb{C}[G/H]$ be the $\mathbb{C}$ -vector space with basis the left cosets G/H . Let $\mathbb{C}[G/\mathcal{H}] = \oplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathbb{C}[G/H_\alpha]$ which will be identified as finitely supported functions $G/\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Denote the kernel of the augmentation $\varepsilon : \mathbb{C}[G/\mathcal{H}] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by Δ .

Definition 12 *The relative cohomology of a discrete group G , with respect to a collection $\mathcal{H}$ of subgroups of G with coefficients in a $\mathbb{C}[G]$ -module A , is given by*

$$H^k(G, \mathcal{H}; A) = \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}^{k-1}(\Delta, A).$$

Denote by $H^k(\mathcal{H}; A) = \prod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} H^k(H_\alpha; A)$. The definition of relative cohomology yields the following consequence, proved in [Au] for the case of a single subgroup and in [BE2] for many subgroups.

Theorem 7 (Auslander, Bieri-Eckmann) *Let G and $\mathcal{H}$ be as above. For any $\mathbb{C}[G]$ -module A there is a long exact sequence:*

$$\dots \rightarrow H^k(G; A) \rightarrow H^k(\mathcal{H}; A) \rightarrow H^{k+1}(G, \mathcal{H}; A) \rightarrow H^{k+1}(G; A) \rightarrow \dots$$

The length-function L on G induces a weight, w , on the cosets G/H given by $w(gH) = \min_{h \in H} L(gh)$. With this weight, define the following bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}, L}(G)$ -module:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}, w}(G/H) = \{f : G/H \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \mid \forall \phi \in \mathcal{B} \sum_{x \in G/H} |f(x)| \phi(w(x)) < \infty\}.$$

This is a Frechet space in the norms given by

$$\|f\|_\phi = \sum_{x \in G/H} |f(x)| \phi(w(x)).$$

Let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Lambda\}$ be a finite collection of subgroups of G , and define

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}, w}(G/\mathcal{H}) = \{f : G/\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \mid \forall \phi \in \mathcal{B} \sum_{x \in G/\mathcal{H}} |f(x)| \phi(w(x)) < \infty\}.$$

As $\mathcal{H}$ is a finite family of subgroups, $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}, w}(G/\mathcal{H}) = \oplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}, w}(G/H_\alpha)$.

The augmentation map $\varepsilon : \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}, w}(G/\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is given by $\varepsilon(f) = \sum_{x \in G/\mathcal{H}} f(x)$. As $\varepsilon(f) \leq \|f\|_1$, ε is a bounded map. Denote the augmentation kernel by $\Delta_{\mathcal{B}} = \ker \varepsilon$.

Definition 13 The relative $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology of a discrete group G , with respect to a collection $\mathcal{H}$ of subgroups of G with coefficients in an $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module A , is given by $\mathcal{B}H^k(G, \mathcal{H}; A) = \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{k-1}(\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}, A)$, where this $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^*(\cdot, A)$ functor is taken over the category of bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -modules.

As in the absolute cohomology theory, there is a comparison homomorphism $\mathcal{B}H^*(G, \mathcal{H}; V) \rightarrow H^*(G, \mathcal{H}; V)$ for any bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module V .

Definition 14 Let G be a discrete group with length function L , and let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite collection of subgroups, and let V be a $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module. We say G is relatively $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological to $\mathcal{H}$ with respect to V (abbr. V - $\mathcal{B}$ RIC) if the relative comparison $\mathcal{B}H^*(G, \mathcal{H}; V) \rightarrow H^*(G, \mathcal{H}; V)$ is an isomorphism of cohomology groups in all degrees. Similarly G is relatively $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological to $\mathcal{H}$ (abbr. $\mathcal{B}$ -RIC) if it is $\mathbb{C}$ - $\mathcal{B}$ RIC, and G is strongly relatively $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological to $\mathcal{H}$ (abbr. $\mathcal{B}$ -SRIC) if it is V - $\mathcal{B}$ RIC for all $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -modules V .

If G is a group and H is a subgroup, there is an isomorphism: $\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}^*(\mathbb{C}[G/H], \mathbb{C}) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}[H]}^*(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C})$. A first step in extending relative cohomology to the $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded framework will be the following analogue.

Lemma 10 Let G be a group with length function L , H a subgroup of G equipped with the restricted length function, and $\mathcal{B}$ a multiplicative bounding class. For any bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module A , there is an isomorphism:

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^*(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H), A) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)}^*(\mathbb{C}, A).$$

Before proving Lemma 10 we first turn our attention to a few additional results which will be necessary.

Lemma 11 For $\mathcal{B}$ a multiplicative bounding class, $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \cong \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)$ both as bornological vector spaces and as right $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)$ -modules, where G/H is given the weight $w(gH) = \min_{h \in H} L(gh)$, and L is the length function on G .

Proof Let R be a system of minimal length representatives for left cosets of H in G . For an $r \in R$, the length of r in G is equal to the length of $rH \in G/H$, so $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H) \cong \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(R)$ as bornological vector spaces. For $g \in G$ there is a unique $h_g \in H$ and $r_g \in R$ such that $g = r_g h_g$.

Let $\Phi : \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(R) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)$ be defined on basis elements by $\Phi(g) = (r_g) \otimes (h_g)$ and extended by linearity. For $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{B}$, let $\nu \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\nu(n) \geq \lambda(2n)\mu(2n)$.

$$|\Phi(g)|_{\lambda, \mu} = |(r_g) \otimes (h_g)|_{\lambda, \mu}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lambda(L(r_g))\mu(L(h_g)) \\
&\leq \lambda(L(g))\mu(L(r_g^{-1}) + L(r_g h_g)) \\
&\leq \lambda(L(g))\mu(2L(g)) \\
&\leq \lambda(2L(g))\mu(2L(g)) \\
&\leq \nu(L(g)).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that Φ is bounded.

Conversely let $\Psi' : \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(R) \times \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ be defined by $\Psi'((r, h)) = (rh)$. For $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}$, let $\lambda'(n) = \lambda(2n) + 1$. By the properties of bounding classes, $\lambda' \in \mathcal{B}$ as well. For $r \in R$ and $h \in H$, set $M_{r,h} = \max\{L(r), L(h)\}$ and $m_{r,h} = \min\{L(r), L(h)\}$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Psi'(r, h)|_\lambda &= |(rh)|_\lambda \\
&= \lambda(L(rh)) \\
&\leq \lambda(L(r) + L(h)) \\
&\leq \lambda(2M_{r,h}) \\
&\leq \lambda'(M_{r,h}) \\
&\leq \lambda'(M_{r,h})\lambda'(m_{r,h}) \\
&= \lambda'(L(r))\lambda'(L(h)).
\end{aligned}$$

As Ψ' is bounded, it extends to a bounded $\Psi : \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(R) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$. These are the required bornological isomorphisms. $\square$

Lemma 12 For any bounding class $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)} \mathbb{C} \cong \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H)$, where H is endowed with the restricted length function and G/H is endowed with the weight w .

Proof By [M2], if $E = H \hat{\otimes} A$ then $E \hat{\otimes}_A F \cong H \hat{\otimes} F$. Appealing to the previous lemma we obtain the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)} \mathbb{C} &\cong (\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)} \mathbb{C} \\
&\cong \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H) \hat{\otimes} \mathbb{C} \\
&\cong \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H).
\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Proof of Lemma 10 Consider

$$\dots \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H) \hat{\otimes}^3 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \rightarrow 0$$

where the boundary map $d_{n+1} : \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)^{\hat{\otimes}^{n+1}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)^{\hat{\otimes}^n}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} d_{n+1}(h_0, h_1, \dots, h_n) &= (h_0 h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n) - (h_0, h_1 h_2, h_3, \dots, h_n) \\ &\quad + \dots + (-1)^{n-1} (h_0, h_1, \dots, h_{n-1} h_n) \\ &\quad + (-1)^n (h_0, \dots, h_{n-1}) \end{aligned}$$

and $d_1 : \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, given by $d_1(h_0) = 1$, is the augmentation. There is a bounded contracting homotopy given by $s_{n+1}(h_0, \dots, h_n) = (1_G, h_0, \dots, h_n)$, where 1_G is the identity element of G , and $s_0 : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ is given by $s_0(z) = z(1_G)$.

$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)}^*(\mathbb{C}, A)$ is the cohomology of the cochain complex

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H), A) &\rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H), A) \\ &\rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)^{\hat{\otimes}^3}, A) \rightarrow \dots \end{aligned}$$

By [M2], for B a bornological algebra, E any bornological space, and F any bornological left B -module, $\text{Hom}_B^{bdd}(B \hat{\otimes} E, F) \cong \text{Hom}^{bdd}(E, F)$. Thus $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)}^*(\mathbb{C}, A)$ is the cohomology of

$$\text{Hom}^{bdd}(\mathbb{C}, A) \rightarrow \text{Hom}^{bdd}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H), A) \rightarrow \text{Hom}^{bdd}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)^{\hat{\otimes}^2}, A) \rightarrow \dots$$

Tensoring each of the left $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)$ modules $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)^{\hat{\otimes}^n}$ by $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ over $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dots \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)} (\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)) &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H) \\ &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)} \mathbb{C} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

As $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)} \mathbb{C} \cong \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H)$, this reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \dots \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)} (\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)) &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H) \\ &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

The bornological isomorphism $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)^{\hat{\otimes}^{n+1}} \cong \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)^{\hat{\otimes}^n}$, given by [M2], shows that this is

$$\dots \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)^{\hat{\otimes}^2} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H) \rightarrow 0.$$

The map $\delta_{n+1} : \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)^{\hat{\otimes}^n} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)^{\hat{\otimes}^{n-1}}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{n+1}(g, h_0, \dots, h_n) &= (gh_0, h_1, \dots, h_n) - (g, h_0 h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n) \\ &\quad + \dots + (-1)^n (g, h_0, \dots, h_{n-1} h_n) \\ &\quad + (-1)^{n+1} (g, h_0, \dots, h_{n-1}) \end{aligned}$$

while the map $\delta_1 : \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H)$ is given by $\delta_1(g) = (gH)$. A bounded contracting homotopy s'_n is constructed as follows. The map $s'_0 : \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ is given by $s'_0(gH) = (r_g)$, where r_g is the fixed minimal length representative of the coset gH in R as above. The map $s'_1 : \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)$ is given by $s'_1(g) = (r_g, h_g)$, where $r_g \in R$, $h_g \in H$, and $g = r_g h_g$. The same For $n > 1$, $s'_n(g, h_0, \dots, h_{n-2}) = (r_g, h_g, h_0, \dots, h_{n-2})$.

As this is a projective resolution of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H)$ over $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$, $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^*(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H), A)$ can be calculated as the cohomology of

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G), A) &\rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H), A) \\ &\rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)^{\hat{\otimes} 2}, A) \rightarrow \dots \end{aligned}$$

As $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)^{\hat{\otimes} n}, A) \cong \text{Hom}^{bdd}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)^{\hat{\otimes} n}, A)$, this is also the same as the cohomology of

$$\text{Hom}^{bdd}(\mathbb{C}, A) \rightarrow \text{Hom}^{bdd}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H), A) \rightarrow \text{Hom}^{bdd}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H)^{\hat{\otimes} 2}, A) \rightarrow \dots$$

□

Denote by $\mathcal{B}H^k(\mathcal{H}; A) = \prod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathcal{B}H^k(H_\alpha; A)$.

Theorem 8 *Let G and $\mathcal{H}$ be as above, and let A be a bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module. For any multiplicative bounding class $\mathcal{B}$, there is a long exact sequence:*

$$\dots \rightarrow \mathcal{B}H^k(G; A) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}H^k(\mathcal{H}; A) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}H^{k+1}(G, \mathcal{H}; A) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}H^{k+1}(G; A) \rightarrow \dots$$

where for each $H_\alpha \in \mathcal{H}$, H_α is given the length function restricted from G and G/H is given the minimal weighting function w as above.

Proof The following short exact sequence admits a bounded $\mathbb{C}$ -splitting.

$$0 \rightarrow \Delta_{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathbb{C} \rightarrow 0$$

Applying the bornological $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^*(\cdot, A)$ functor, yields the long exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} \dots \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^k(\mathbb{C}, A) &\rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^k(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H), A) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^k(\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}, A) \\ &\rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{k+1}(\mathbb{C}, A) \rightarrow \dots \end{aligned}$$

Making use of the isomorphisms,

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^k(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H), A) = \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^k(\oplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H_\alpha), A)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\cong \prod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^k(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/H_\alpha), A) \\ &\cong \prod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H_\alpha)}^k(\mathbb{C}, A) \end{aligned}$$

one obtains the exact sequence

$$\dots \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^k(\mathbb{C}, A) \rightarrow \prod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(H_\alpha)}^k(\mathbb{C}, A) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^k(\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}, A) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{k+1}(\mathbb{C}, A) \rightarrow \dots$$

By definition $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^k(\mathbb{C}, A) = \mathcal{B}H^{k+1}(G; A)$, and $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^k(\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}, A) = \mathcal{B}H^{k+1}(G, \mathcal{H}; A)$. $\square$

Corollary 3 *Let G be a finitely generated group with length function L , $\mathcal{B}$ a multiplicative bounding class, and $\mathcal{H} = \{H_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Lambda\}$ a finite family of subgroups. Suppose that there is a $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module V such that each H_α is V - $\mathcal{B}$ IC, in the length function restricted from G . If G is V - $\mathcal{B}$ RIC to $\mathcal{H}$, then G is V - $\mathcal{B}$ IC. In particular, if each H_α is $\mathcal{B}$ -SIC and G is $\mathcal{B}$ -SRIC to $\mathcal{H}$, then G is $\mathcal{B}$ -SIC.*

Proof The comparison map yields a commutative diagram with top row the long exact sequence from Theorem 8 and the bottom row the long exact sequence from Theorem 7. The result follows from the five-lemma. $\square$

The notion of ‘niceness’ defined above has an obvious extension to free resolutions of modules other than $\mathbb{Z}$ over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$. The following generalization of Lemma 1 to the relative setting is straightforward.

Lemma 13 *Let G be a group equipped with word-length function L , R_* a k -nice resolution of M over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$, $T_* = R_* \otimes \mathbb{C}$, and $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B}'$ bounding classes. Denote by $\mathcal{B}T_*$ the corresponding Frechet completion of T_* with respect to the bounding class $\mathcal{B}$, as defined above. Further suppose that the weighted Dehn functions $\{d_R^{w,n}\}$ are $\mathcal{B}'$ -bounded in dimensions $n < k$, that $\mathcal{B}$ is a right $\mathcal{B}'$ -class, and that $\mathcal{B} \succeq \mathcal{L}$. Then there exists a bounded chain null-homotopy $\{s_{n+1} : \mathcal{B}T_n \rightarrow \mathcal{B}T_{n+1}\}_{k > n \geq 0}$, implying $\mathcal{B}T_*$ is a continuous resolution of $\mathcal{B}M$ over $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ through dimension k . Here, $\mathcal{B}M$ denotes the completion of $M \otimes \mathbb{C}$ via the bounding class $\mathcal{B}$.*

This yields a suitable complex from which we may calculate bounded relative cohomology of G with respect to $\mathcal{H}$.

Theorem 9 Suppose the finitely generated group G is HF^∞ relative to the finite family of finitely generated subgroups $\mathcal{H}$.

- (1) The relative Dehn functions of G relative to $\mathcal{H}$ are each $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded.
- (2) G is $\mathcal{B}$ -SRIC with respect to $\mathcal{H}$.
- (3) The comparison map $\mathcal{B}H^*(G, \mathcal{H}; A) \rightarrow H^*(G, \mathcal{H}; A)$ is surjective for all bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -modules A .

Proof For (1) implies (2), suppose A is a bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module, and let

$$R_* := \dots \rightarrow R_2 \rightarrow R_1 \rightarrow R_0 \rightarrow R_{-1} = \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow 0$$

be a nice type FF^∞ resolution of $\Delta_{\mathbb{Z}}$, the integral augmentation kernel, over $\mathbb{Z}[G]$, and let

$$T_* := \dots \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow T_{-1} = \Delta \rightarrow 0$$

be given by $T_n = R_n \otimes \mathbb{C}$. Here Δ is the complex augmentation kernel. T_* is a type FF^∞ resolution of Δ over $\mathbb{C}[G]$. As the relative Dehn functions are $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded, by the previous lemma gives that $\mathcal{B}T_*$ is a bornologically projective resolution of $\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}$ over $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$. Let V_n be the complex vector space with one basis element for each generator of T_n over $\mathbb{C}[G]$. There are isomorphisms $T_n \cong \mathbb{C}[G] \otimes V_n$ and $\mathcal{B}T_n \cong \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes} V_n$. Apply $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}(\cdot, A)$ to the deleted resolution T_* yields a cochain complex with terms of the form $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}(T_n, A)$. Applying $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{bdd}(\cdot, A)$ to the deleted resolution $\mathcal{B}T_*$ yields a cochain complex with terms of the form $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{B}T_n, A)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}(T_n, A) &\cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}(\mathbb{C}[G] \otimes V_n, A) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}(V_n, A) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G) \hat{\otimes} V_n, A) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^{bdd}(\mathcal{B}T_n, A) \end{aligned}$$

As A was arbitrary we obtain that G is $\mathcal{B}$ -SRIC with respect to $\mathcal{H}$.

The implication (2) implies (3) is obvious. For (3) implies (1), follow the proof the implication (B2) implies (B1) of Theorem 3 with the following modifications. Replace the absolute cocycles and boundaries, by the relative cocycles and boundaries. The argument applies nearly verbatim. $\square$

For the remainder of the section, we suppose that G is a finitely presented group which acts cocompactly without inversion on a contractible complex X , with finite edge stabilizers and finitely generated vertex stabilizers G_σ . The higher weighted Dehn functions of X bound the topological relative Dehn functions of G with respect to the $\{G_\sigma\}$. Applying Theorem 9 we obtain the following.

Theorem 10 *Suppose all of the higher weighted Dehn functions of $C_*(X)$ are $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded. Then G is $\mathcal{B}$ -SRIC with respect to the $\{G_\sigma\}$.*

To use this result effectively, we must be able to determine how the restricted length function on G_σ behaves, when compared to the usual word-length function on G_σ .

Lemma 14 *Suppose the first unweighted geometric Dehn function of X is $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded. Then the standard word-length function, L_{G_σ} , on G_σ , for every σ , is $\mathcal{B}$ -equivalent to the length function on G_σ , induced by the restriction of L_G to G_σ . Specifically, there exists a $\nu \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $L_{G_\sigma}(g) \leq \nu(L_G(g))$ for all $g \in G_\sigma$ and all σ .*

Proof The finite edge stabilizers imply that the first relative Dehn function (in the meaning of Osin [Os]), is equivalent to the first Dehn function of X , by [BC]. Thus it is $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded. By Lemma 5.4 of [Os], the distortion of each $H \in \mathcal{H}$ is bounded by the relative Dehn function. Thus each H is at most $\mathcal{B}$ -distorted. $\square$

The following is a generalization of a result in [JR1], which states that if a finitely generated group G is relatively hyperbolic to a family of finitely generated subgroups $\mathcal{H}$, and if each $H \in \mathcal{H}$ is HF^∞ and $\mathcal{P}$ -SIC, then G is $\mathcal{P}$ -SIC.

Corollary 4 *Suppose the finitely generated group G is relatively hyperbolic with respect to the family of finitely generated subgroups $\mathcal{H}$. If $\mathcal{L} \preceq \mathcal{B}$, then G is $\mathcal{B}$ -SRIC with respect to $\mathcal{H}$.*

Proof By Mineyev-Yaman [MY], there is a contractible hyperbolic complex X on which G acts cocompactly with finite edge stabilizers, and vertex stabilizers precisely the H and their translates. Lemma 14 gives the result. $\square$

Corollary 5 *Suppose the finitely generated group G is relatively hyperbolic with respect to the family of finitely generated subgroups $\mathcal{H}$, and $\mathcal{B}$ is a multiplicative bounding class with $\mathcal{L} \preceq \mathcal{B}$. For any bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{L}}(G)$ -module M , if each $H \in \mathcal{H}$ is M - $\mathcal{B}$ IC, then G is M - $\mathcal{B}$ IC. In particular, if each H is $\mathcal{B}$ -SIC then G is $\mathcal{B}$ -SIC.*

5 Two spectral sequences in $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology

5.1 The Hochschild-Serre spectral sequence

We begin with a finiteness result which was first proven for polynomially bounded cohomology in [M1].

Theorem 11 *Let (G, L) be V - $\mathcal{B}$ IC with respect to the trivial $\mathcal{H}_{\beta, L}(G)$ -module $V \neq 0$. Assume that V is metrizable, with distance function d_V . Then for each $n \geq 0$,*

$$\mathcal{B}H^n(G; V) = H^n(G; V) \cong \bigoplus^{k_n} V$$

Proof By contradiction. First, note that the weight function on $C_*(EG)$ induces a weight function on $H_*(BG)$ by $w([x]) = \min\{w(x') \mid [x'] = [x]\}$. The statement that G is V - $\mathcal{B}$ IC is then equivalent to requiring that for each $n \geq 1$ and for all $[c] \in H^n(BG)$, there exists a $\phi_n \in \mathcal{B}$ such that for all $[x] \in H_n(BG)$, $d_V([c]([x]), 0) \leq \phi_n(w([x]))$. Next, $H^n(G; V) \cong \text{Hom}(H_n(G), V)$ by the Universal Coefficient Theorem. Suppose $H^n(G; V)$ is not a finite sum of copies of V . This can only happen if $H_n(G)$ is infinite-dimensional over $\mathbb{C}$. Choose a countably infinite linearly independent set $[x_1], [x_2], \dots, [x_n], \dots$ of elements in $H_n(G)$; we normalize each element so that $w([x_i]) = 1$ for each $1 \leq i$. Then for each i , fix a cohomology class $[c_i] \in H^n(G; V)$ with $d_V([c_i]([x_j]), 0) = \delta_{ij}$. The set $\{[c_1], [c_2], \dots, [c_m], \dots\}$ is a countably infinite generating set for a subspace $W = \prod_1^\infty \mathbb{C} \subset H^n(G; V)$. An element of W may be written as

$$C = (n_1, n_2, n_3, \dots, n_m, \dots)$$

indicating that the $[c_i]$ -component of C is $n_i[c_i]$. Define a cohomology class $[C^f]$ by

$$[C^f] = (f(1), f(2), \dots, f(n), \dots) \in W$$

By construction,

$$d_V([C^f]([x_m]), 0) = f(m)[c_m]([x_m]) = f(m)$$

for each $m \geq 1$. Choosing the function f to be unbounded (which we can certainly do) makes $[C^f]$ unbounded on the set of n -dimensional homology classes with weight 1. This contradicts the assumption that (G, L) is $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological with respect to V , regardless of the choice of $\mathcal{B}$. $\square$

The following theorem was proven in [O1] in the context of p.s. G -modules. It was shown in the bornological case in [Ra].

Theorem 12 ([Ra, O1]) *Let $0 \rightarrow (G_1, L_1) \rightarrow (G_2, L_2) \rightarrow (G_3, L_3) \rightarrow 0$ be an extension of groups with length functions, and let (G_1, L_1) be $\mathcal{P}$ -IC. There is a bornological spectral sequence with $E_2^{p,q} \cong \mathcal{P}H^p(G_3; \mathcal{P}H^q(G_1))$ and which converges to $\mathcal{P}H^*(G)$.*

A similar result holds with more general bounding classes and coefficients.

Theorem 13 (Weak Serre spectral sequence in $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology) *Let $(G_1, L_1) \twoheadrightarrow (G_2, L_2) \twoheadrightarrow (G_3, L_3)$ be a short-exact sequence of groups with word-length. Suppose that V is a metrizable (bornological) $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}, L_3}(G_3)$ -module, and that (G_1, L_1) is V - $\mathcal{B}$ IC. Then there exists a spectral sequence*

$$E_2^{p,q} = \mathcal{B}H^p(G_3; \mathcal{B}H^q(G_1; V)) \Rightarrow \mathcal{B}H^{p+q}(G_2; V)$$

Hence if (G_3, L_3) is V - $\mathcal{B}$ IC, (G_2, L_2) is V - $\mathcal{B}$ IC (where the $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}, L_2}(G_2)$ -module structure on V is induced by the projection $G_2 \rightarrow G_3$).

Proof As (G_1, L_1) is V - $\mathcal{B}$ IC, $\mathcal{B}H^*(G_1; V) \cong \mathbb{C}^{k_n} \otimes V$ by what we have shown above. It means that if (G_3, L_3) is V - $\mathcal{B}$ IC, it is $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological with respect to $\mathcal{B}H^*(G_1; V)$. Then by a spectral sequence comparison, (G_2, L_2) will be V - $\mathcal{B}$ IC. $\square$

The Serre spectral sequence can be used to study the complexity of groups that occur as subgroups of hyperbolic groups.

Theorem 14 *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a bounding class with $\mathcal{E} \preceq \mathcal{B}$. If there exists a finitely-presented group G which is not $\mathcal{B}$ -IC, then such an example must occur as a finitely-generated normal subgroup of a finitely-generated word-hyperbolic group.*

Proof By [Ri, BMS], every finitely-presented group G admits a presentation

$$K \twoheadrightarrow \mathfrak{H} \twoheadrightarrow G$$

where $\mathfrak{H}$ is hyperbolic, K is a finitely-generated (normal) subgroup of $\mathfrak{H}$, and the length function on G is the word-length function. As all of the Dehn functions of $\mathfrak{H}$ are linear, $\mathfrak{H}$ is strongly $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological for all bound classes $\mathcal{B} \succeq \mathcal{L}$. In addition, the hyperbolicity of $\mathfrak{H}$ implies that the distortion of the embedding $K \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ is at most simple exponential, so the induced metric on K coming from its embedding in $\mathfrak{H}$ and the word-length function on K are $\mathcal{B}$ -equivalent.

Suppose now that K is $\mathcal{B}$ -IC. By Theorem 13, this guarantees the existence of a Serre Spectral sequence with appropriate E_2^{**} -term. Consider the comparison map of spectral sequences

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^i(G) : \{\mathcal{B}H^p(G; \mathcal{B}H^q(K))\}_{pq} \rightarrow \{H^p(G; H^q(K))\}_{pq}$$

This is an isomorphism on the $p = 0, 1$ lines by the isocohomologicality of K together with the fact G is finitely-generated and equipped with word-length function. By the assumption on G , there is smallest value of $m \geq 2$ for which the comparison map $\mathcal{B}H^m(G) \rightarrow H^m(G)$ fails to be an isomorphism. Because the map of spectral sequences is an isomorphism on the vertical p -lines for all $p < m$, this difference of $E_2^{m,0}$ -groups must persist to E_{∞}^{**} in one of two ways:

- All elements of $\ker(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^m(G))$ and $\operatorname{coker}(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^m(G))$ (which are permanent cycles) survive to E_{∞}^{**} . In this case, because the $E_{\infty}^{m,0}$ -term has lowest filtration degree in $H^i(\mathfrak{H})$ ⁵ these elements would produce elements in either the kernel or cokernel of the comparison map for $\mathfrak{H}$ in degree m .
- Some element in either $\ker(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^m(G))$ or $\operatorname{coker}(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^m(G))$ produces a boundary in $E_r^{m,0}$ for some $r \geq 2$ which does not survive to $E_{\infty}^{m,0}$. This difference must propagate to produce a difference in the E_{∞} -terms with total degree less than m . Again, by choosing the smallest filtration degree in which this occurs (i.e., largest value of p), we see this would produce a non-zero element $\ker(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^j(\mathfrak{H}))$ or $\operatorname{coker}(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^j(\mathfrak{H}))$ for some $j < m$.

In both cases, the result contradicts the isocohomologicality of $\mathfrak{H}$. Hence the assumption that K is $\mathcal{B}$ -IC must be false. $\square$

In fact, as noted in [BH, Ex. 6.19 (1)], the distortion of a finitely generated subgroup N of a finitely generated group G is at most simple exponential, so the theorem above may be generalized to

Theorem 15 *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a bounding class with $\mathcal{E} \preceq \mathcal{B}$, and $(G_1, L_1) \twoheadrightarrow (G_2, L_2) \rightarrow (G_3, L_3)$ is a short-exact sequence of finitely generated groups with word-length. Suppose that (G_2, L_2) is $\mathcal{B}$ -IC, but (G_3, L_3) is not. Then (G_1, L_1) is not $\mathcal{B}$ -IC.*

⁵As both spectral sequences are arising from exact couples, the usual interpretation of the E_{∞}^{**} -terms applies: for $F^* = \mathcal{B}H^*(-)$ or $H^*(-)$, F^n is a filtered object $\{F_0^n \subset F_1^n \subset \cdots \subset F_n^n = F^n\}$ with F_k^n/F_{k-1}^n corresponding to the $E_{\infty}^{-k,k}$ -term of the appropriate spectral sequence. Moreover, the comparison map, coming from a map of exact couples, is filtration-preserving

5.2 The spectral sequence associated to a group acting on a complex

Following Section 1.6 of [S], suppose that a finitely generated group G acts cocompactly on an acyclic simplicial complex X without inversion. For a simplex σ of X , denote the stabilizer of σ by G_σ . Denote by Σ a set of representatives of simplexes of X modulo the G action, and by Σ_q the q -dimensional representatives in Σ .

Let $C_*(X)$ denote the simplicial chain complex of X . As X is acyclic, there is an exact sequence

$$0 \leftarrow \mathbb{C} \leftarrow C_0(X) \leftarrow C_1(X) \leftarrow C_2(X) \leftarrow \dots$$

There is a direct-sum decomposition $C_q(X) \cong \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_q} \mathbb{C}[G/G_\sigma]$. For each $\sigma \in \Sigma$, let $P_k^\sigma = \mathbb{C}[G \times_{G_\sigma} (G_\sigma)^{k+1}]$, the usual simplicial structure on G_σ induced up to a $\mathbb{C}[G]$ -module. In this way, $P_\bullet^\sigma$ is a projective $\mathbb{C}[G]$ resolution of $\mathbb{C}[G/G_\sigma]$. This yields a double complex

$$(29) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_0} P_2^\sigma & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_1} P_2^\sigma & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_2} P_2^\sigma & \longleftarrow \dots \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_0} P_1^\sigma & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_1} P_1^\sigma & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_2} P_1^\sigma & \longleftarrow \dots \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_0} P_0^\sigma & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_1} P_0^\sigma & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_2} P_0^\sigma & \longleftarrow \dots \end{array}$$

As each Σ_q is finite, applying $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}(\cdot, M)$ yields the following double complex.

(30)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & \\
& \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
\bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_0} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}(P_2^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_1} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}(P_2^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_2} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}(P_2^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \dots \\
& \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
\bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_0} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}(P_1^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_1} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}(P_1^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_2} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}(P_1^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \dots \\
& \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
\bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_0} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}(P_0^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_1} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}(P_0^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_2} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}(P_0^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \dots
\end{array}$$

Examine the spectral sequence arising from the columnwise filtration on this double complex. That P_*^σ be a projective $\mathbb{C}[G]$ resolution of $\mathbb{C}[G/G_\sigma]$ means that $\bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_0} P_*^\sigma$ is a projective resolution of $\bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_0} \mathbb{C}[G/G_\sigma]$. The $E_1^{p,q}$ -term of this spectral sequence is then

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}^q \left(\bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_p} \mathbb{C}[G/G_\sigma], M \right) &\cong \prod_{\sigma \in \Sigma_p} \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}[G]}^q (\mathbb{C}[G/G_\sigma], M) \\
&\cong \prod_{\sigma \in \Sigma_p} \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}[G_\sigma]}^q (\mathbb{C}, M) \\
&\cong \prod_{\sigma \in \Sigma_p} H^q(G_\sigma; M)
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the total complex of the double complex in equation 29, serves as a projective resolution of $\mathbb{C}$ over $\mathbb{C}[G]$, yielding a theorem of Serre.

Theorem 16 (Serre) *For each $\mathbb{C}G$ -module M , there is a spectral sequence with $E_1^{p,q} \cong \prod_{\sigma \in \Sigma_p} H^q(G_\sigma; M)$ and which converges to $H^{p+q}(G; M)$.*

This extends to the $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded case, when the stabilizers are given the length function restricted from G .

Let $C_m^\mathcal{B}(X)$ be defined as in the proof of Theorem 3. If the higher weighted Dehn functions of X are $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded, $C_*^\mathcal{B}(X)$ gives a chain complex of complete bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -modules, endowed with a bounded $\mathbb{C}$ -linear contracting homotopy. There is a natural quotient length, w , defined on G/G_σ induced from the length L on G via

$w(gG_\sigma) := \min\{L(gh) \mid h \in G_\sigma\}$. Denote by $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/G_\sigma)$ the completion $\mathbb{C}[G/G_\sigma]$ under the following family of seminorms.

$$|\sum_{x \in G/G_\sigma} \alpha_x x|_\lambda := \sum_{x \in G/G_\sigma} |\alpha_x| \lambda(w(x)) \quad \lambda \in \mathcal{B}$$

There is a bornological isomorphism $C_q^{\mathcal{B}}(X) \cong \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_q} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/G_\sigma)$. Similarly, let $\mathcal{B}P_k^\sigma$ denote the corresponding completion of P_k^σ . As above, we obtain a double complex, but of bornological $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -modules.

$$(31) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_0} \mathcal{B}P_2^\sigma & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_1} \mathcal{B}P_2^\sigma & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_2} \mathcal{B}P_2^\sigma & \longleftarrow & \dots \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_0} \mathcal{B}P_1^\sigma & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_1} \mathcal{B}P_1^\sigma & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_2} \mathcal{B}P_1^\sigma & \longleftarrow & \dots \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_0} \mathcal{B}P_0^\sigma & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_1} \mathcal{B}P_0^\sigma & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_2} \mathcal{B}P_0^\sigma & \longleftarrow & \dots \end{array}$$

For any $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module M , applying the bounded equivariant homomorphism functor $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}(\cdot, M)$ yields the following.

$$(32) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_0} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}(\mathcal{B}P_2^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_1} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}(\mathcal{B}P_2^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_2} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}(\mathcal{B}P_2^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \dots \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_0} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}(\mathcal{B}P_1^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_1} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}(\mathcal{B}P_1^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_2} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}(\mathcal{B}P_1^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \dots \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_0} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}(\mathcal{B}P_0^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_1} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}(\mathcal{B}P_0^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \Sigma_2} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}(\mathcal{B}P_0^\sigma, M) & \longleftarrow & \dots \end{array}$$

As in the non-bornological case above, by examining the columnwise filtration on this double complex we obtain a spectral sequence that converges to the cohomology of the total complex. The choice of w on G/G_σ ensures a bornological isomorphism $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)}^*(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},w}(G/G_\sigma), M) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G_\sigma)}^*(\mathbb{C}, M)$. As above we find $E_1^{p,q} \cong \prod_{\sigma \in \Sigma_p} \mathcal{B}H^q(G_\sigma; M)$.

Moreover, the total complex of 31 gives a projective resolution of $\mathbb{C}$ over $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$. This verifies the following theorem.

Theorem 17 *Suppose all higher weighted Dehn functions of $C_*(X)$ are $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded, when the acyclic complex X is equipped with the 1-skeleton weighting. For each $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module M , there is a spectral sequence with E_1 -term the product of the $\mathcal{B}H^*(G_\sigma; M)$ which converges to $\mathcal{B}H^*(G; M)$.*

By comparison with the spectral sequence from Theorem 16, we immediately obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 6 *Suppose the acyclic complex X is equipped with the 1-skeleton weighting, and all higher weighted Dehn functions of $C_*(X)$ are $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded. If M is a $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module for which each (G_σ, L) is M - $\mathcal{B}IC$, then (G, L) is M - $\mathcal{B}IC$. In particular if each (G_σ, L) is $\mathcal{B}$ - SIC , so is (G, L) .*

6 Duality groups and the comparison map

6.1 Duality and Poincaré Duality Groups

We recall that G is a duality group of dimension n if there exists a G -module D such that

$$H^i(G, M) \cong H_{n-i}(G, D \otimes M)$$

If this is the case, then $D = H^n(G, \mathbb{Z}[G])$ is the dualizing module. When $D = \mathbb{Z}$, the group is called a Poincaré Duality group. It is orientable precisely when the action of G on D (induced by the right action of G on $\mathbb{Z}[G]$) is trivial. All known orientable Poincaré Duality groups occur as the fundamental group of a closed orientable aspherical manifold.

6.2 Isocohomologicality and the fundamental class

The question of isocohomologicality for oriented duality groups is answered by the following theorem. All homology and cohomology groups are taken with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}$.

Theorem 18 *Let M be a compact, closed, orientable manifold of dim. n which is aspherical ($\tilde{M} \simeq *$). Let $G = \pi_1(M)$, and let $\mu_G'' \in H^n(M \times M)$ denote the fundamental cohomology class in $H^*(M \times M)$ dual to the diagonal embedding $\Delta(M) \subset M \times M$ ⁶. If μ_G'' is in the image of the comparison map $\Phi_B^* : \mathcal{B}H^*(G \times G) \rightarrow H^*(G \times G)$ with respect to a length function L on G , then (G, L) is $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological.*

Proof Assume L fixed, and consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^i(G) & \xrightleftharpoons[-\cap \mu_G]{-\cap \mu_G} & H_{n-i}(G) \\ \Phi_B^* \uparrow & \mu_G'' / - & \downarrow \Phi_B^* \\ \mathcal{B}H^i(G) & \xrightleftharpoons[-\cap \mu_G^B]{-\cap \mu_G^B} & \mathcal{B}H_{n-i}(G) \\ & \text{?} & \end{array}$$

⁶This class is simply the image, under the restriction map $H^*(M \times M, M \times M - \Delta(M)) \rightarrow H^*(M \times M)$, of the Thom class associated to the normal bundle of the diagonal embedding.

Here $\mu_G \in H_n(G) = H_n(M)$ denotes the fundamental homology class of M . Now $- \cap \mu_G$ is an isomorphism with inverse given by $\mu_G'' / -$. The homology class $\mu_G^{\mathcal{B}} \in \mathcal{B}H_n(G)$ is simply the image of $\mu_G \in H_n(G)$ under the comparison map $\Psi_*^{\mathcal{B}}$. By section 2.6,

$$- \cap \mu_G^{\mathcal{B}} = \Phi_*^{\mathcal{B}} \circ (- \cap \mu_G) \circ \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^*$$

In fact this identity follows from a similar one that holds on the (co)chain level. If there exists a class ${}_{\mathcal{B}}\mu_G'' \in \mathcal{B}H^n(G \times G)$ satisfying $\mu_G'' = \Psi_{\mathcal{B}}^*({}_{\mathcal{B}}\mu_G'')$, then taking $? = {}_{\mathcal{B}}\mu_G'' / -$ in the above diagram and appealing again to section 5.1, we get the second identity

$$\mu_G'' / - = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^* \circ ({}_{\mathcal{B}}\mu_G'' / -) \circ \Phi_*^{\mathcal{B}}$$

This implies the diagram, with “?” so defined, is commutative. The fact that the maps at the top are isomorphisms then implies all of the other maps in the diagram are as well. $\square$

[Note: There is a different way of thinking about this result. By the Duality Theorem (Thm. 11.10 of [MS]), for any basis $\{b_i\}$ of $H^*(G) = H^*(M)$, taken as a (finite-dimensional) graded vector space over $\mathbb{C}$, there exists a “dual” basis $\{b_j^{\sharp}\}$ with $\langle b_i \cup b_j^{\sharp}, \mu_G \rangle = \delta_{ij}$. In terms of these bases, μ_G'' is given by the equation

$$\mu_G'' = \sum_i (-1)^{\dim(b_i)} b_i \times b_i^{\sharp}$$

The condition that this class is $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded then forces each of the b_i ’s (and hence also the $b_j^{\sharp}$ ’s) to be $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded, via linear independence.]

When BG has the homotopy type of an oriented manifold with boundary, we have a similar result.

Theorem 19 *Suppose (G, L) is a group with word-length, such that $BG \simeq M$ an oriented compact n -dimensional manifold with connected boundary ∂M . Assume also that ∂M is aspherical, and incompressibly embedded in M (i.e., the induced map on fundamental groups $\pi_1(\partial M) \rightarrow \pi_1(M)$ is injective). Let $D(M) = M \cup_{\partial(M)} M$ denote the double of M along its boundary. If the fundamental cohomology classes of both $D(M)$ and ∂M are both in the image of the comparison map for a bounding class $\mathcal{B}$ (in the manner described by theorem 18), then G is $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological.*

Proof Let $G'_i = \pi_1(\partial M)$ and $G'' = \pi_1(D(M))$. By Van Kampen’s theorem, $G'' \cong G \underset{G'}{*} G$; moreover, the incompressibility of ∂M in M implies $D(M) \simeq K(G'', 1)$ is aspherical. Now consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \cdots & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}H^{j-1}(G') & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \mathcal{B}H^j(G'') & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}H^j(G) \oplus \mathcal{B}H^j(G) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}H^j(G') \longrightarrow \cdots \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \cdots & \longrightarrow & H^{j-1}(G') & \xrightarrow{\delta} & H^j(G'') & \longrightarrow & H^j(G) \oplus H^j(G) \longrightarrow H^j(G') \xrightarrow{\delta} \cdots
 \end{array}$$

Both the top and bottom sequences are derived from the collapsing of the spectral sequence associated to a group acting on a complex (in this case, a tree with two edges and three vertices, representing the amalgamated free product). The vertical maps are induced by the comparison transformation $\mathcal{B}H^*(-) \rightarrow H^*(-)$, implying the diagram is commutative. By Theorem 18, the comparison map is an isomorphism for both G' and G'' (both of whose classifying spaces are represented by compact, oriented finite-dimensional manifolds without boundary). The result follows by the five-lemma. $\square$

It is not clear if this is the best possible result when the boundary is non-empty, i.e., whether $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomologicality for G could be guaranteed by the $\mathcal{B}$ -boundedness of a single cohomology class. It is also not clear what one can say in general if either ∂M is not aspherical, or if it is, but not incompressibly embedded in M . All of these situations would seem to deserve further attention.

6.3 $\mathcal{B}$ -duality groups

Using the pairing operations of section 2.6, one has an obvious extension of the definition of a duality group to the $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded setting.

Definition 15 Given a bounding class $\mathcal{B}$ and a group with word-length (G, L) , we say that G is a $\mathcal{B}$ -duality group of dimension n if there exists an $H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -module $D_{\mathcal{B}}$ and a “fundamental class” $\mu_{\mathcal{B}} \in \mathcal{B}H_n(G, D_{\mathcal{B}})$ with

$$\mathcal{B}H^i(G, V) \xrightarrow[\cong]{-\cap \mu_{\mathcal{B}}} \mathcal{B}H_{n-i}(G, D_{\mathcal{B}} \widehat{\otimes} V)$$

Theorem 20 Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a bounding class, and (G, L) a $\mathcal{B}$ -duality group with duality module $D_{\mathcal{B}}$. Suppose $\mu^{\mathcal{B}}$ is in the image of the comparison map $\Psi_*^{\mathcal{B}}$. Then

- If $D_{\mathcal{B}}$ is finite-dimensional over $\mathbb{C}$, (G, L) is strongly monoco-homological (that is, the comparison map is injective in cohomology for all bornological $H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -modules V).
- If $D_{\mathcal{B}}$ is infinite-dimensional over $\mathbb{C}$, (G, L) is monoco-homological for all bornological $H_{\mathcal{B},L}(G)$ -modules V which are finite-dimensional over $\mathbb{C}$.

Proof Choose $\mu_D \in H_n(G, D)$ with $\Phi_n^{\mathcal{B}}(\mu_D) = \mu_D^{\mathcal{B}}$. We can consider a diagram analogous to that of Theorem (18):

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 H^i(G, V) & \xrightarrow{-\cap \mu_D} & H_{n-i}(G, D_{\mathcal{B}} \otimes V) \\
 \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^* \uparrow & & \downarrow \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^* \\
 \mathcal{B}H^i(G, V) & \xrightarrow{-\cap \mu_D^{\mathcal{B}}} & \mathcal{B}H_{n-i}(G, D_{\mathcal{B}} \hat{\otimes} V)
 \end{array}$$

At issue in this diagram is the difference between $D_{\mathcal{B}} \otimes V$ and $D_{\mathcal{B}} \hat{\otimes} V$. However, if either $D_{\mathcal{B}}$ or V is finite-dimensional over $\mathbb{C}$, this difference vanishes and the diagram commutes, verifying injectivity of the comparison map in the cases indicated. Note that we do not assume the top horizontal map in the above diagram is an isomorphism. $\square$

Remark Ideally, one would like to prove the diagram commutes whenever $\mu^{\mathcal{B}}$ is in the image of the comparison map. However, we have not yet been able to show this.

6.4 Two solvmanifolds

We construct examples of groups π , admitting closed oriented compact manifold models for $B\pi$ of small dimension, for which the comparison map fails to be surjective.

Let L_n denote the standard word-length function on $\mathbb{Z}^n$, and set

$$LWL_n(g) = \log(1 + L_n(g))$$

This is still a length function on $\mathbb{Z}^n$, but it is not $\mathcal{B}$ -equivalent to L_n unless $\mathcal{E} \preceq \mathcal{B}$.

Proposition 3 Let $\mathcal{B}H_{\log}^*(\mathbb{Z}^n)$ denote the $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology of the group with word-length $(\mathbb{Z}^n, LWL_n)$. Then for all $\mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{E}$,

$$0 = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^* : \mathcal{B}H_{\log}^*(\mathbb{Z}^n) \rightarrow H^*(\mathbb{Z}^n), \quad * > 0$$

Proof There is a commuting diagram of extensions of groups with word-length

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}, LWL_{n-1}) & \longrightarrow & (\mathbb{Z}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{Z}, LWL_{n-1} \times LWL_1) & \longrightarrow & (\mathbb{Z}, LWL_1) \\ \downarrow Id & & \downarrow & & \downarrow Id \\ (\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}, LWL_{n-1}) & \longrightarrow & (\mathbb{Z}^n, LWL_n) & \longrightarrow & (\mathbb{Z}, LWL_1) \end{array}$$

Because the inclusion is a split-injection, the technical hypothesis [ref. above] is satisfied, allowing for the construction of the Hochschild-Serre spectral sequence for both the top and bottom sequences. By a spectral sequence comparison, we see that the middle downward arrow induces an isomorphism in $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology. For the top-middle group, the $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology decomposes as a tensor product. The result is an isomorphism of graded vector spaces

$$(33) \quad \mathcal{B}H_{\log}^*(\mathbb{Z}^n) \cong \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{B}H_{\log}^*(\mathbb{Z})$$

It remains to show that $\mathcal{B}H^*(\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^*(\mathbb{Z})$ is the zero map for $* > 0$, i.e., for $* = 1$. When $* = 1$, elements of $\mathcal{B}H^1(\mathbb{Z})$ correspond bijectively to group homomorphisms from $\mathbb{Z}$ to $\mathbb{C}$, equipped with its usual norm. The norm of any non-zero homomorphism grows linearly with respect to the standard word-length function on $\mathbb{Z}$. This means it grows exponentially as a function of LWL_1 . When $\mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{E}$, this is impossible, implying $\mathcal{B}H^1(\mathbb{Z}) = 0$ in this case. $\square$

Example 1 [Gromov] As above, assume $\mathcal{L} \preceq \mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{E}$ and let G be the semi-direct product $\mathbb{Z}^2 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}$, where $\mathbb{Z}$ act on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ by the representation

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

This is a split-extension of $\mathbb{Z}$ by $\mathbb{Z}^2$; moreover, $\mathbb{Z}^2$ has exponential distortion in G . This is equivalent to saying the induced word-length function on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ coming from the embedding in G is (linearly) equivalent to LWL_2 . For the base group $\mathbb{Z}$, the word-length function induced by the projection $G \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is the standard one. Now the Hochschild-Serre spectral sequence in ordinary cohomology for this extension satisfies

$E_2^{**} = E_\infty^{**}$ for dimensional reasons. Embedding $\mathbb{Z}^2 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}$ in the solvable Lie group $\mathbb{R}^2 \rtimes \mathbb{R}$, the action of the base on the fiber (over $\mathbb{R}$) is similar to the action given by $r \circ (r_1, r_2) = (e^{\lambda r} r_1, e^{-\lambda r} r_2)$. The first exterior power of this representation has no invariant subspaces, while the second exterior power is the identity. Hence $E_2^{0,1} = H^0(\mathbb{Z}; H^1(\mathbb{Z}^2)) = 0$, while $E_2^{0,2} = H^0(\mathbb{Z}; H^2(\mathbb{Z}^2)) \cong \mathbb{C}$. On classifying spaces the short-exact sequence $\mathbb{Z}^2 \hookrightarrow G \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ produces a fibration sequence of closed oriented manifolds and orientation-preserving maps. This yields a Poincaré Duality map on the E_2^{**} -term of the spectral sequence for $H^*(G)$. By this duality, we conclude $E_2^{0,1}$ is dual to $E_2^{1,1}$ which therefore must also be zero (we already knew $H^1(\mathbb{Z}) = E_2^{1,0} \cong E_2^{0,2} = H^0(\mathbb{Z}; H^2(\mathbb{Z}^2)) \cong \mathbb{C}$). This gives an isomorphism $H^*(G) \cong H^*(\mathbb{Z}) \otimes H^*(\mathbb{Z}^2)$, although there is no homomorphism of groups inducing it. If we denote by $t_i \in H^i(G)$ the element corresponding to the generator of $H^i(\mathbb{Z}^i)$, $i = 1, 2$ (after fixing a preferred orientation of BG), then

Proposition 4 *The cohomology class $t_2 \in H^2(G) \cong \mathbb{C}$ cannot lie in the image of the comparison map $\Psi_B^2 : \mathcal{B}H^2(G) \rightarrow H^2(G)$ whenever $\mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{E}$.*

Proof The comparison map is natural with respect to those maps induced by group homomorphisms, implying the existence of a commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{B}H^2(G) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}H_{\log}^2(\mathbb{Z}^2) \\ \downarrow \Psi_B^2 & & \downarrow \Psi_B^2 \\ H^2(G) & \longrightarrow & H^2(\mathbb{Z}^2) \end{array}$$

For $\mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{E}$, the map on the right is trivial by Proposition 3, while the spectral sequence argument for ordinary cohomology just given shows the lower horizontal map sends t_2 non-trivially to the generator of $H^2(\mathbb{Z}^2) \cong \mathbb{C}$. Thus t_2 cannot be in the image of Ψ_B^2 (this is in the spirit to Gromov's original argument referenced above). $\square$

With some additional work, one can also show $t_1 t_2 \in H^3(G)$ is not in the image of Ψ_B^3 whenever $\mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{E}$. Of course, by Theorem 18, The dual fundamental class $u' \in H^3(G \times G)$ cannot be in the image of Ψ_B^3 for $\mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{E}$.

There are some additional consequences of this first example worth noting (with $\mathcal{P} \preceq \mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{E}$).

- All surface groups are non-positively curved - hence $\mathcal{B}$ -IC - so 3 is the lowest dimension for which there can exist a closed oriented $K(\pi, 1)$ manifold with non- $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology.
- Nilpotent groups are $\mathcal{B}$ -IC when $\mathcal{P} \prec \mathcal{B}$ [O1], [JR1], so solvable groups are the simplest types of groups which could have non- $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded cohomology for $\mathcal{P} \preceq \mathcal{B}$.
- For finitely-generated groups, all 1-dimensional cohomology classes exhibit linear growth with respect to the word-length function, so cohomological dimension 2 is the first dimension in which classes not $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded with respect to the word-length function could occur.
- If the first Dehn function of G were $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded, G would have to be strongly $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological in cohomology dimensions 1 and 2. By contradiction, we recover the result of Gersten [Ge1] that the first Dehn function of G must be (at least) exponential.

Example 2 [Arzhantseva-Osin] Let $\phi : \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow SL_3(\mathbb{Z})$ be an injection sending the usual generators of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ to semi-simple matrices with real spectrum. Denote by H be the semi-direct product $\mathbb{Z}^3 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}^2$ where $\mathbb{Z}^2$ acts via the representation induced by ϕ .

The classifying space BH is homotopy-equivalent to a 5-dimensional closed, compact, and oriented solvmanifold M^5 . It is shown in [AO] that $\mathbb{Z}^3$ is exponentially distorted in H in a manner similar to the previous example.

Theorem 21 *There exists a cohomology class $t_3 \in H^3(H)$ not in the image of $\Psi_{\mathcal{B}}^3$ for any $\mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{E}$.*

Proof On the level of classifying spaces, the short-exact sequence $\mathbb{Z}^3 \xrightarrow{i} H \xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{Z}^2$ corresponds to a fibration sequence of closed oriented compact manifolds, with the maps preserving orientation. Thus the top-dimensional cohomology class $\mu_5 \in H^5(H)$ satisfies $\mu_5 = \mu_3 \mu_2$ where μ_3 maps under i^* to $0 \neq \mu'_3 \in H^3(\mathbb{Z}^3)^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$ (the $\mathbb{Z}^2$ -invariant fundamental cohomology class of $\mathbb{Z}^3$), and $\mu_2 = p^*(\mu'_2)$ where $\mu'_2 \in H^2(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ is the fundamental cohomology class for $\mathbb{Z}^2$.

As before, there is a commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{B}H^3(H) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}H_{\log}^3(\mathbb{Z}^3) \\
\downarrow \Psi_{\mathcal{B}}^3 & & \downarrow \Psi_{\mathcal{B}}^3 \\
H^3(G) & \longrightarrow & H^3(\mathbb{Z}^3)
\end{array}$$

where the map on the right is zero. The result follows. $\square$

By a more detailed analysis, one can conclude that $\mu_5 \in H^5(H) \cong \mathbb{C}$ is not $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded for any $\mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{E}$, and by Theorem 18, we know the same for the dual fundamental class in $H^5(H \times H)$. However, this example is important for another reason.

Corollary 7 *The Dehn functions of H are not $\mathcal{B}$ -equivalent for any bounding class $\mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{E}$. Precisely, the first Dehn function is quadratic, while the second Dehn function is at least simple exponential.*

Proof The first Dehn function of H was computed in [AO], where it was shown to be quadratic. If the second Dehn function were $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded for some $\mathcal{L} \preceq \mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{E}$, then by Theorem 4, the group H would have to be $\mathcal{B}$ -isocohomological through dimension 3 contradicting the previous result. So the second Dehn function must be at least simple exponential. $\square$

6.5 More on the comparison map

We have shown the comparison map fails to be surjective in general, at least for bounding classes $\mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{E}$. It is natural to ask whether this map also fails to be injective. The next theorem answers this question.

Theorem 22 *Let (G, L_{st}) be a discrete group with standard word-length function, with $BG \simeq Y$ a finite complex. If $\mathcal{B}$ is a bounding class for which the comparison map $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^*(G) : \mathcal{B}H^*(G) \rightarrow H^*(G)$ fails to be surjective, then there is another group $\mathfrak{F}(G)$, depending functorially on G up to homotopy, for which the comparison map $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^*$ fails to be injective.*

Proof As BG is homotopically finite, we may construct a finitely-generated hyperbolic group $\mathfrak{H}(G)$ and a map $p_G : \mathfrak{H}(G) \rightarrow G$ which induces an injection in group cohomology with trivial coefficients [Gr, CD, DJ]. Also, for any discrete group G' , a classical construction allow us to embed G' in an acyclic group $A(G')$, where the inclusion $i_{G'} : G' \hookrightarrow A(G')$ is a functorial construction in G' . If G' is finitely-generated and equipped with the standard word-length function, we can arrange for the image of G' in $A(G')$ to be non-distorted. Abbreviate $\mathfrak{H}(G)$ as C , and let $A_1 = G \times A(C)$, $A_2 = A(C)$. There are inclusions

$$(34) \quad C \hookrightarrow A_1, \quad g \mapsto (p_G(g), i_C(g)),$$

$$(35) \quad C \hookrightarrow A_2, \quad g \mapsto i_C(g)$$

Let $A_3 = A_1 *_C A_2$. By the spectral sequence of section 5.1, there is a commuting diagram of Mayer-Vietoris sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} \cdots & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}H^{j-1}(C) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \mathcal{B}H^j(A_3) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}H^j(A_1) \oplus \mathcal{B}H^j(A_2) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}H^j(C) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}H^{j+1}(A_3) & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\ & & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow & & \\ \cdots & \longrightarrow & H^{j-1}(C) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & H^j(A_3) & \longrightarrow & H^j(A_1) \oplus H^j(A_2) & \longrightarrow & H^j(C) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & H^{j+1}(A_3) & \longrightarrow & \cdots \end{array}$$

Because C is finitely-generated hyperbolic, the comparison map for C is an isomorphism for all $\mathcal{L} \preceq \mathcal{B}$. Moreover, $H^*(A_2) = 0$ for $* > 0$, and $F^*(A_1) \cong F^*(G) \otimes F^*(A(C))$ for $F^*(-) = \mathcal{B}H^*(-), H^*(-)$. Hence the cokernel of the comparison map for A_1 is naturally isomorphic to the cokernel of the comparison map for G . The injectivity of $H^*(G) \rightarrow H^*(C)$ implies the map $H^j(A_3) \rightarrow H^j(A_1) \oplus H^j(A_2)$ is zero for $j > 0$. The result is an injection

$$\text{coker}(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^* : \mathcal{B}H^*(A_1) \oplus \mathcal{B}H^*(A_2) \rightarrow H^*(A_1) \oplus H^*(A_2)) \hookrightarrow \ker(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^{*+1} : \mathcal{B}H^{*+1}(A_3) \rightarrow H^{*+1}(A_3))$$

Define $\mathfrak{F}(G) = A_3$. If $\text{coker}(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^m(G)) \neq 0$, then $\ker(\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^{m+1}(\mathfrak{F}(G))) \neq 0$. The acyclic group construction $G \mapsto A(G)$ can be done functorially, as can the hyperbolization of the finite complex Y . However, this requires choosing a finite complex $Y \simeq BG$, which, on the category of type finitely-presented FL groups, is functorial only up to homotopy. $\square$

Corollary 8 *There exist discrete groups equipped with standard word-length function for which the comparison map $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^3$ fails to be injective for all $\mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{E}$.*

Proof Let G be the group in Proposition 4. By the previous theorem, $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^3(\mathfrak{F}(G))$ cannot be an injection for any $\mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{E}$. $\square$

It should be noted that the groups resulting from the above constructions will typically have large classifying spaces, even when BG has the homotopy type of a relatively simple complex. The following alternative construction provides a more geometric model for the acyclic “envelope” used above. Again, assume G is type FL , so that $BG \simeq Y$ a finite complex. According to recent work of Leary [L], we may construct a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_Y & \longrightarrow & T_{\widehat{Y}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Y & \longrightarrow & \widehat{Y} \end{array}$$

where $\widehat{Y}$ denotes the cone on Y (which can be done so as to be functorial in Y and preserve finiteness), and where T_X denotes the “metric” Kan-Thurston space over X . By [L], this is a $\text{CAT}(0)$ -space (hence aspherical) whose construction is functorial on the category of finite complexes, for which the map $T_X \rightarrow X$ is a homology isomorphism. Thus in the above setup, we can replace C by $C_1 := \pi_1(T_Y)$ and $A(C)$ by $C_2 := \pi_1(\widehat{Y})$, and repeat the construction with $A_1 = G \times C_2$, $A_2 = C_2$, $\mathfrak{F}(G) = A_3 = A_1 \underset{C_1}{*} A_2$, the difference now being that A_1, A_2 as well as the amalgamated product A_3 are all of type FL . Because $\text{CAT}(0)$ -groups admit a synchronous linear combing, they are $\mathcal{B}$ -SIC for all $\mathcal{B} \succeq \mathcal{P}$. Hence

Theorem 23 *Let (G, L_{st}) be a group of type FL with standard word-length function, where $BG \simeq Y$ a finite complex. If $\mathcal{B} \succeq \mathcal{P}$ is a bounding class for which the comparison map $\Psi_{\mathcal{B}}(G) : \mathcal{B}H^*(G) \rightarrow H^*(G)$ fails to be surjective, then there is another group $\mathfrak{F}(G)$ of type FL , depending functorially on G up to homotopy, for which the comparison map $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^*$ fails to be injective.*

Corollary 9 *There exist discrete groups equipped with standard word-length function of type FL for which the comparison map $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}^3$ fails to be injective for all $\mathcal{P} \preceq \mathcal{B} \prec \mathcal{E}$.*

References

- [A] J. ALONSO, Combings of groups, *Algorithms and Classification in Combinatorial Group Theory* (G. Baumslag and C. F. Miller III, eds.), MSRI series, vol. 23, Springer-Verlag, 1991.
- [AWP] J. ALONSO, X. WANG and S. PRIDE, Higher-dimensional isoperimetric (or Dehn) functions of groups. *Journal of Group Theory*, vol. 2 (1999), no. 1, pp. 81 – 112.
- [AO] G. ARZHANTSEVA and D. OSIN, Solvable groups with polynomial Dehn functions, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 354 (2002), pp. 3329 – 3348.
- [Au] M. AUSLANDER, Relative cohomology theory of groups and continuations of homomorphisms, Thesis, Columbia University, New York, 1954.
- [BMS] G. BAUMSLAG, C. MILLER, H. SHORT, Unsolvability problems about small cancellation and word hyperbolic groups, *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, **26** (1994), pp. 97 – 101.
- [BE1] R. BIERI, B. ECKMANN, Finiteness properties of duality groups, *Comment. Math. Helv.*, **49** (1974), pp. 74 – 83.
- [BE2] R. BIERI, B. ECKMANN, Relative homology and Poincaré duality for group pairs, *J. of Pure and Applied Algebra*, **13** (1978), pp. 277 – 319.
- [BRS] N. BRADY, T. RILEY, H. SHORT, The Geometry of the Word Problem for Finitely Generated Groups, (Birkhauser-Verlag, 2007).
- [BC] S. BRICK, J. CORSON, Dehn functions and complexes of groups, *Glasgow Math. J.*, **40** (1998), pp. 33 – 46.
- [Br1] K. S. BROWN, Finiteness properties of groups, *Jour. of Pure and App. Alg.* **44** (1987), pp. 45 – 75.
- [Br2] K. S. BROWN, Cohomology of groups, (Springer, Berlin, 1982).
- [CD] R. CHARNEY, M. DAVIS, Strict hyperbolization, *Topology* 34 (1995), pp. 329–350.
- [DJ] M. DAVIS, T. JANUSZKIEWICZ, Hyperbolization of polyhedra, *J. Diff. Geom.* 34 (1991), pp. 347–388.
- [DS] C. DRUTU, M. SAPIR, Relatively Hyperbolic Groups with the Rapid Decay Property, *International Mathematics Research Notices*, (2005), pp. 1181-1194.
- [Fa] B. FARB, Relatively Hyperbolic groups, *GAF*, **8**, (1998), pp. 810 – 840.
- [Ge] S. GERSTEN, Finiteness Properties of Asynchronously Automatic Groups, *Geometric Group Theory* (R.Charney, M. Davis, and M. Shapiro, eds.), MSRI Publications.
- [Gr] M. GROMOV, Hyperbolic groups, *Essays in Group Theory* (S. Gersten, ed.), MSRI Publications.
- [H] H. HOGBE-NLEND, Bornologies and functional analysis, (North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1977).

- [J] R. JI, Smooth dense subalgebras of reduced C^* -algebras, Schwartz cohomology of groups, and cyclic cohomology, *J. Funct. Anal.* **107** (1992), pp. 1 – 33.
- [JOR1] R. JI, C. OGLE, B. RAMSEY, Relatively hyperbolic groups, rapid decay algebras and a generalization of the Bass Conjecture, *Jour. of Non-Comm. Geom.* **4** (1) (2010), pp. 83 – 124.
- [JOR3] R. JI, C. OGLE, B. RAMSEY, In preparation.
- [JR1] R. JI, B. RAMSEY, The isocohomological property, higher Dehn functions, and relatively hyperbolic groups *Adv. in Math.* **222** (2009) pp. 255 – 280.
- [L] I. LEARY, A metric Kan-Thurston Theorem, *OSU preprint* (2010).
- [M1] R. MEYER, Combable groups have group cohomology of polynomial growth, *Quart. J. Math.* **57** (2006), pp. 241 – 261.
- [M2] R. MEYER, Embeddings of derived categories of bornological modules, arXiv:math/0410596v1.
- [M3] R. MEYER, Bornological versus Topological Analysis in Metrizable Spaces, *Banach Spaces and their Applications*, Contemp. Math. **363** (2004), 249 – 278.
- [MS] J. MILNOR, J. STASHEFF, Characteristic Classes (Princeton Univ. Press, 1974).
- [MY] I. MINEYEV, A. YAMAN, Relative hyperbolicity and bounded cohomology. Preprint.
- [N] G. NOSKOV, Algebras of rapidly decreasing function on groups and cocycles of polynomial growth, *Sibersk. Mat. Zh.* **33** (4) (1992) pp. 97 – 103.
- [O1] C. OGLE, Polynomially bounded cohomology and discrete groups, *Jour. of Pure and App. Alg.* **195** (2005) pp. 173 – 209.
- [O2] C. OGLE, Polynomially bounded cohomology and the Novikov Conjecture, arXiv:math/1004.4680v2.
- [Ol] A. OLSHANSKII, Hyperbolicity of groups with subquadratic isoperimetric inequality. *International Journal of Algebra and Computation*, vol. 1 (1991), no. 3, pp. 281 – 289.
- [Os] D. OSIN, Relatively hyperbolic groups: Intrinsic geometry, algebraic properties, and algorithmic problems.
- [Ra] B. RAMSEY, IUPUI thesis, (2008).
- [Ri] E. RIPS, Subgroups of small cancellation groups, *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, **14** (1982), pp. 45 – 47.
- [S] J.P. SERRE, Cohomologie des groupes discrets. Ann. Math. Studies 70, pp. 77 – 169, Princeton Univ. Press, 1971.

Department of Mathematical Sciences, IUPUI
Indianapolis, IN 46202, USA

Department of Mathematics, The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210, USA

*Department of Mathematics, University of Hawaii at Manoa
Honolulu, HI 96822, USA*

ronji@math.iupui.edu, ogle@math.ohio-state.edu,
bwramsey@math.hawaii.edu